

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 26, 1980

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT).

## DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
February 25, 1980.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore on Tuesday, February 26, 1980.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

## PRAYER

The Reverend Priit Rebane, pastor, Trinity Lutheran Church and the Estonian Lutheran Congregation of Florida, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., offered the following prayer:

Dear Father of all nations:

We are grateful for the manifold blessings You have showered on our people and Nation, and we thank You for the feeling of national pride which our people experienced through recent victories on Olympic ice.

Challenge, we pray, our Nation to continue its moral and spiritual leadership in the world. May that raised torch of liberty continue to be the hope of all captives—whether they be Americans in their embassy in a foreign country, a nation of Estonian people behind the Iron Curtain, or countries that are denied their basic human rights of self-determination and freedom.

Be the strength of individuals in lands where they cannot speak their convictions and are imprisoned or mercilessly hounded for them.

Guide the Members of this House so that Your will be accomplished through them.

In Jesus' name I pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Chiridon, one of his secretaries.

## THE REVEREND PRIIT REBANE

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce our guest chaplain for today, the Reverend Priit Rebane, my constituent who is the pastor of the Trinity Lutheran Church in St. Petersburg, Fla., and the chaplain for the Estonian community in St. Petersburg and the central Florida area.

Reverend Rebane is here today in honor of the 62d anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Estonia, which unfortunately is now under Soviet rule. This is the 13th consecutive year that an Estonian-American clergyman has given the opening prayer in the House of Representatives in recognition of the anniversary, but it is the first time a Floridian has had the honor of representing the Estonian community before the House.

Reverend Rebane was born in Pilstvere, Estonia, on August 24, 1937. He was forced to flee to Germany with his family when Communist armies invaded Estonia in 1944. He lived in displaced persons camps for the next 6 years with his mother Maie, father Hans, and his brother Henn. Reverend Rebane and his family emigrated to the United States on June 10, 1950. The Trinity Lutheran Church of St. Petersburg, the church Reverend Rebane now serves, was the same church that sponsored the Rebane family as refugees in 1950.

Reverend Rebane attended public high school in Philadelphia and college in Allentown, Pa., before returning to Philadelphia to enter the seminary. Following his graduation, he became an assistant pastor in Nazareth, Pa., then he organized the King Glory Lutheran Church in Fort Worth, Tex., and New Port Richey, Fla.

Reverend Rebane married the former Judith Petree in 1961, and has two sons, Michael and Scott.

While the Rebane family made it out of Estonia, there are many who did not and remain there under Soviet rule. We should take a moment to memorialize the plight of the Baltic people who have been overcome by the ruthless tyranny of the Soviet Union.

I pay tribute to Reverend Rebane and hope that his presence here will lend moral encouragement to those Estonian people still suffering under Soviet rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to welcome Reverend Rebane here to the House of Representatives.

## REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4473, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, 1980

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 4473) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would inquire of the gentleman from Maryland when he would plan to bring the conference report to the floor if he receives unanimous consent today.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. As soon as possible under the rules.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Meaning by Friday?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I have explored this with the leadership and if Friday is the first day we can bring it up under the rules, it should be Friday. If we can bring it up earlier than that that will be fine. I would like to get it adopted as soon as possible.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I share the gentleman's thought but because of the timing I have not had an opportunity to discuss this with the gentleman and I feel I must object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman would withdraw his objection, let the Chair assure the gentleman the leadership would very much appreciate the opportunity for the bill to be filed in order that we might expedite an opportunity to consider it. The bill has been held over since last year as the gentleman from Florida no doubt is aware of. The conferees have been meeting and have finally reached what appears to be an agreement, as the gentleman from Maryland rightly advises.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am very reluctant to do this but we have had no discussion on this matter. There are a number of amendments in disagreement. I do not believe that between now and Friday the House will have ample time to prepare for a discussion and debate on this conference report.

Further reserving the right to object I might say we were in conference back on the 1st day of November. We went from the 1st day of November until just yesterday before we even had another conference so evidently the time concern was not evident at that point.

Mr. Speaker, as reluctant as I am, I must object.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House Proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

#### THE IRRELEVANT PRESIDENCY OF JIMMY CARTER

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent Newsweek poll shows that only 39 percent of Americans feel the President is very responsible for the economy today.

Sixty-four percent feel that our current problems with Iran would have happened regardless of President Carter's policies.

These figures demonstrate what I have long suspected, the American people have ceased to believe that what President Carter does or says is relevant to our problems. He is seen as a nice man who sits quietly in the White House, appears on television now and then and smiles a lot.

The inflation rate is now at an annual rate of 18 percent, the prime lending rate has gone through the roof, our defenses are at their weakest point in years, the economy is in turmoil, and we have no energy policy. Yet President Carter is higher in the popularity polls than he has ever been.

This irrelevant President has caused disaster after disaster, only to see them turn into political success.

The medieval alchemists were looking for ways to turn lead into gold. They should have known Jimmy Carter's secret.

#### WHERE IS THIS COUNTRY HEADING?

(Mr. PASHAYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, the signal is out. Economists are now assessing the current rate of inflation and state of the economy as the worst since World War II. Where is this country heading?

During the past 25 years our Nation has sustained Federal deficits for all but 4 of those years and has amassed a national debt climbing to a trillion dollars. We are now being told that our lack of fiscal constraint is leading to an inflation rate in 1980 of over 18 percent. Where is this country heading?

We are destroying capital formation and potential jobs for our unemployed, we are rapidly depleting the buying power of the dollar for our social and defense programs, and we are continuing to spend billions of dollars on the interest generated from past years of deficit spending.

Where is our country heading, Mr. Speaker? The time has long come for a balanced budget. We must mark that change now.

#### WE SHOULD NOT BOYCOTT 1980 SUMMER OLYMPICS

(Mr. GOLDWATER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, the 1980 winter Olympics are now history, but the memories—the poignant memories of the coming together of the world's young people in peaceful competition gave me, for the first time in a couple of months, a feeling about what is worthwhile in this world.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of 13 Members who voted against the boycott of the 1980 summer Olympics, and if I had it to do over again, I would still do it. There are thousands of young people around the world who are the heartwarming stories of the 1980 summer Olympics. What a tragedy that those stories will probably never reach fruition because their efforts have become a pawn for politicians, and their attainments will become a sacrifice to symbolism, that will produce no concrete results.

Mr. Speaker, let Americans train, participate, and win in the 1980 summer Olympics as they did at Lake Placid. I believe that the U.S. participation at Lake Placid did more to refute the propaganda efforts of communism than any boycott will ever do.

#### GOVERNOR TREEN ADDRESSES HOUSE FOR LAST TIME

(Mr. TREEN asked for and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, although my resignation from this House, occasioned by my election to the Governorship of Louisiana, will not be effective until March 10, this is the last day that I will be in this Chamber. While I look forward very much to the new challenge and responsibility I will take up on March 10, it is with a great deal of regret that I take my departure from the House of Representatives.

I am going to miss tremendously the daily contacts, associations, and relationships that I have built up in the little more than 7 years I have been here. It is, of course, a rare privilege to serve in the House of Representatives, a privilege for which I will forever be grateful to the people of the Third Congressional District of Louisiana.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the Speaker, the officers of the House, and the employees, for their many, many courtesies extended to me over these past 7 years, and to say to all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that I appreciate the cooperation, the guidance, the help, and most of all, the friendship that has been afforded me so graciously and so generously over these years.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of Cali-

fornia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREEN. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving with the gentleman on the Armed Services Committee, and I want to say, as one Member on the other side of the aisle, that the gentleman has been one of the most intelligent and hard-working members of our committee. Until the time came for him to start campaigning in Louisiana, he has been one of the most hard-working members of that committee, one of the most dutiful members we have had.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman the best of everything in his new responsibilities.

Mr. TREEN. I thank the gentleman. It has been a tremendous privilege to serve with him on the Armed Services Committee, under the leadership of our chairman, MEL PRICE, the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California (Mr. BOB WILSON). I am going to miss those associations very much.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman for his service here and say how lucky the State of Louisiana is in having him as its new Governor. Many times we say that the Federal Government rarely sends anything down to the States but trouble. I think, in this case, we are sending down a solution. I think the State is lucky, and I repeat how proud we are, those of us who came into Congress in the gentleman's class, that he has moved on to be Governor of Louisiana. We compliment him.

Mr. TREEN. I thank the gentleman. I am pleased to have served with him on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and I have enjoyed that association very much.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES AND COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on House Administration:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1980.  
Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, the  
Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Due to my election to the House Appropriations Committee by the Democratic Caucus, effective today, February 26, 1980, I am resigning my membership on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on House Administration.

Sincerely yours,

VIC FAZIO,  
Member of Congress.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.  
There was no objection.

#### ELECTION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic Caucus and by the authority and direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 585) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 585

*Resolved*, That the following-named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: VIC FAZIO, California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THE 1979 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, February 26, 1980.)

#### UNITED NATIONS PRESENCE IN INDOCHINESE REFUGEE CAMPS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should request the United Nations to establish an international presence in the refugee encampments on the border between Thailand and Kampuchea, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 72

Whereas the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand has demonstrated to the world its humanitarian convictions by opening its borders and providing asylum and assistance to the Khmer people who have been victims of war, famine, and oppression in Kampuchea;

Whereas the international community owes a great debt of gratitude to the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand for its compassionate actions on behalf of the Khmer people;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of Khmer have fled their homes in Kampuchea seeking security, food, and medical assistance;

Whereas many of these refugees have settled temporarily in encampments along the border between Thailand and Kampuchea where food, water, and medical care have been made available to them;

Whereas the security of the refugees in these encampments is continually threatened because of the unrest and the lack of an international presence in that border area;

Whereas armed conflict within these encampments has forced many refugees, often

in fragile physical condition, to flee in fear for their physical safety;

Whereas food which is being provided by international organizations for humanitarian relief to refugees in these encampments may not be reaching those with the greatest need because of a lack of supervision of its distribution;

Whereas the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand has requested the United Nations to provide international observers in the area of the border between Thailand and Kampuchea, but no action has been taken; and

Whereas the international community, acting through the United Nations, has an obligation to provide such assistance to the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand as may be necessary in support of its efforts on behalf of the Khmer people: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, should request the United Nations to establish under its auspices an international presence in the encampments of Khmer refugees along the border between the Kingdom of Thailand and Kampuchea for the purposes of—

(1) promoting security and stability for the refugees in encampments along the border between Thailand and Kampuchea;

(2) overseeing the distribution of food and water to insure that they are equitably distributed to those refugees for whom they are intended;

(3) demonstrating that the assistance which is being provided to refugees in such encampments by the United Nations and other international agencies is solely for humanitarian purposes; and

(4) encouraging all nations in the region to respect the use of the border area between Thailand and Kampuchea as a sanctuary for those Khmer who are in need of humanitarian assistance.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PRITCHARD) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 72, expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should request the United Nations to establish an international presence in the refugee encampments on the border between Thailand and Kampuchea, and for other purposes.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 72, which is identical to House Concurrent Resolution 274, was passed by the Senate by a voice vote on February 19, 1980. House Concurrent Resolution 274 was ordered favorably reported by unanimous voice vote in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on February 12.

At the outset I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcom-

mittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, Mr. WOLFF, and the subcommittee's ranking minority member, Mr. GUYER, for their efforts to bring this timely resolution to the floor of the House. I also want to commend the other cosponsors of the resolution: Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mrs. BOGGS, Ms. SCHROEDER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. HECKLER, Mrs. FENWICK, Mrs. SNOWE, and Mr. OBERSTAR for their support and continuing interest in this matter.

Last month, the gentleman from Wisconsin, along with the ranking minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the chairmen and the ranking minority members of the Subcommittees on International Operations and Asian and Pacific Affairs, wrote a letter to Mr. Poul Hartling, U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees. In that letter we stated our conviction that a bona fide international presence must be established in the Khmer refugee encampments along the Thailand-Kampuchea border in order to prevent a disaster. The refugee encampments in that area have already experienced intramural fighting among armed contingents opposed to the Phnom Penh government as well as clashes between those groups and the Thai security forces in the area.

As a result of these incidents, the international relief effort on the border which has been extremely successful in feeding the refugees has undergone several unfortunate suspensions. Now there are ominous indications that the 50,000 Vietnamese combat troops deployed near the border area may be on the verge of military operations to disperse the refugee population in the border encampments. Just this past weekend, fighting between Vietnamese-supported Phnom Penh forces and Khmer Rouge remnants has been reported near the area in question. Such an action would create more refugees, both Khmer and Thai, severely hamper the ongoing border relief program, and further destabilize the area.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 72, and the House companion resolution (House Concurrent Resolution 274), call on the President to request the U.N. to establish an international presence in those encampments in order to promote security and stability in the encampments and to improve the distribution of the food and medical assistance being delivered there.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 72 and yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, for his comments and to be the manager of the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 72.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Chair will allow me to say at the outset that we are deeply indebted to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the speed with which he helped to bring this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution offered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs reflects the thinking as well of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, and underscores the concerns of many of us for the past several years.

We have felt and we continue to feel that the humanitarian concerns raised by the plight of the Cambodian refugees along the Thai-Kampuchea border far outweigh any political issues which might arise.

However, we recognize that a grave military threat exists in the area, not only to the refugees, but particularly to Thailand, because of the large numbers of well-armed contending forces.

Thus, we feel that a United Nations presence could help defuse a very dangerous situation to large numbers of people, as well as to a nation of vital strategic importance to the United States.

At the least, this resolution could help many hundred of thousands of refugees now crowded into camps along the border. At best, it might help set in process a method of eventual resolution of the tragedy of Kampuchea.

Perhaps best of all for the moment, this amendment will not cost the taxpayers any money. Briefly, the resolution is designed to accomplish the following:

As Chairman ZABLOCKI has stated, the resolution calls for an international presence, under United Nations auspices, in Khmer refugee camps along the Thailand-Kampuchea border.

It is our intent that the resolution:

First, promote security and stability for the refugees in the camps along the border.

Second, oversee the distribution of food and water to insure that they are equitably distributed to those refugees for whom they are intended.

Third, demonstrate that the assistance which is being provided to refugees in the encampments by the U.N. and other international donors is solely for humanitarian purposes.

Fourth, encourage all nations in the regions to respect the use of the border area between Thailand and Kampuchea as a sanctuary for those refugees who are in need of humanitarian assistance.

#### BACKGROUND/POSSIBLE QUESTIONS

There are presently nearly 300,000 people in the border camps. Problems have arisen because at least two of the major camps are "controlled" by factions opposed to the Vietnamese, and somewhat to each other. Thus, food and medical relief is not necessarily being fairly distributed in the camps, and allegations of bribes, black markets, et cetera, have been raised and substantiated.

While it is true that the U.N. probably could not get permission from the Heng Samrin government in Phnom Penh to set up in camps actually in Kampuchea—because the U.N. does not recognize that regime—there are still major camps and areas within Thailand which would benefit from the U.N. presence, and, of course, the precedent would be set—possibilities for Kampuchea would be opened, in other words.

Finally, and importantly, the U.N. presence would hopefully help clear up some of the administrative problems—inherent in the black market problems—which make the border operation so difficult, despite all the international money, and good will.

This bill does not address the situation in Kampuchea proper.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Critical shortages of food and the threat of continued fighting between Vietnamese forces and Khmer Rouge forces loyal to the ousted Communist government of Pol Pot have sent massive numbers of Cambodian refugees into or near neighboring Thailand. Estimates go as high as 1 million in that area on both sides of the border, but mostly in Thailand. The problems posed by this human tide are both humanitarian and political in nature. As my friend (Mr. WOLFE), the chairman of the subcommittee, has pointed out, what we are really concerned with here today is the humanitarian aspect of this problem.

For the moment, the most pressing aspect of the humanitarian problem, the need for adequate food and medical assistance, is still present, although perhaps the great crisis we had awhile back has passed to at least some extent. The political problem promises to be more long term and for the time being seems to be almost insoluble.

However, I think it is very important that an independent presence be established in the refugee encampments in Cambodia and on the border between Thailand and Cambodia.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee of Asian and Pacific Affairs, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFE).

I believe that an international presence, a United Nations presence, in the refugee encampments in Thailand and Kampuchea is particularly important at this time. Those refugee centers are endangered by continued hostility, hostility from the Vietnamese, hostility from the opposing Military Forces in Kampuchea and hostility within the encampments.

During our committee's recent visit to Thailand, we had an opportunity to discuss the issue with the Prime Minister. He expressed concern about the safety of the Kampuchean refugees in the border encampments. I do not believe that the responsibility for protecting these hundreds of thousands of refugees on the borders between Thailand and Kampuchea should be the responsibility of any one nation. It is extremely im-

portant, if we truly have a humanitarian concern for the safety of these refugees, that there be an international presence, a United Nations presence, in these camps.

Since 1975 the situation in Cambodia has produced a series of horror stories. We can only guess at the tragedy visited upon the Khmer people by the Pol Pot and Heng Samrin governments. We believe that over 2 million people have died as a result of that ongoing tragedy. We know that upwards of a million more are now on the frontier between Kampuchea and Thailand, seeking desperately to avoid being caught either by or between the Pol Pot and Heng Samrin forces.

How can those people be cared for? There have been tremendous outpourings of humanitarian food and medical relief. The international community, the people of many countries, have provided good support for the Khmer refugees. Yet only a small percentage, perhaps a third, of those huddled along that unfortunate frontier are in organized camps. The rest are virtually nomads who roam back and forth across the line to obtain food and refuge. And among them are of course those who still resist the forces of Heng Samrin, and others who resist both Pol Pot and Heng Samrin, the Khmer Serei. All of this makes systematic care very difficult, especially when the United Nations personnel who would normally bring some order to the situation are only there part time—rarely overnight.

We have to put more people on the ground in the Thai-Kampuchean frontier, in order to make it more difficult for the exploiters of human suffering—the black marketeers and the like—to take advantage. We must also head off any possible Vietnamese attack which could result from fire fights spilling into the refugee areas, with grave human and international results.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this worthy resolution.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of S. 72, which is identical to the measure reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee, House Concurrent Resolution 274. There are clear and compelling reasons for the action called for in this bill. There needs to be an international presence in the Khmer refugee areas on the frontier between Thailand and Kampuchea.

The numbers of Khmers who have found sanctuary from the Vietnamese invasion, or from remnants of the Pol Pot forces in Thailand have now reached somewhere close to a million people. They are being fed and assisted by the international community. Yet these locations are not by any means the well-organized, relatively comfortable camps which have been in place for 4 or 5 years now elsewhere in Thailand. These Khmer locations are huge centers which have grown hurriedly under the impetus of war in Kampuchea.

In assessing the impact of these huge numbers, we need to remember that the Government of Thailand had extreme political difficulty accommodating the



250,000 Lao and Hmong refugees. That experience has not rendered Thailand somehow immune to the effects of the Khmer human wave. For the government led by Prime Minister Kriangsak to open its frontiers to the Khmers, as it has done, was an act of political courage considered purely in domestic Thai political terms.

The international implications for Thailand are even more grave, perhaps. The presence of the Khmers on their frontier opens the way for conflict between the Thais and the Vietnamese forces in Kampuchea. Vietnamese under the Hanoi puppet Heng Samrin could very well, in pursuit of either Khmer Rouge or Khmer Seret, invade Thai territory. Some of the resistance camps are surrounded by if not located in Khmer refugee concentrations.

Thus there should be a permanent United Nations presence on the Kampuchean frontier, in order to make it more difficult for the Vietnamese to strike, and to make it less convenient for Khmer of any political color to use refugee areas as staging centers for their activities back into Kampuchea.

This action has been requested directly of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The Thai Government has asked the UNHCR to do this, and Members of the U.S. Congress have done so also. So far no such action has been taken. So the risks remain high of border conflict. And the absence of a round-the-clock presence by some international agency in the critical regions gives rise to the spectre of government by night which is quite different than government by day. Black marketing and profiteering will be worsened, and the orderly operation of the sites in question will be virtually impossible.

Therefore, for the protection of the Khmers in question, and to ease the Thai security situation, I urge the House to join the other body in seeking the appropriate steps called for in this resolution.

● **Ms. MIKULSKI.** Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 72, legislation which would encourage the United Nations to establish an official presence in the refugee camps along the Thai-Kampuchean border. In my view, the presence of the U.N. in these camps where so many thousands of refugees are now languishing would be an important step in improving their plight. It would promote security and stability in the camps as well as improve the basic living standards for those refugees now living in them.

In the past 4 years, approximately 4 million Kampucheans have died as a result of the strife and famine in that nation. More Kampucheans will probably die unless action is taken to protect the survivors. Last fall, I had the opportunity as part of the Congresswomen's delegation to visit both Thailand and Kampuchea. The horror which I viewed there is almost beyond human comprehension. I will never be able to forget the sights of starving and dying people—men, women, and most tragically, children.

Currently, several hundred thousand Kampucheans are living in these camps.

The number of new refugees continues to multiply daily. One of my most serious concerns is that the Vietnamese army might attack the camps, resulting in the mass slaughter of a larger number of inhabitants. I believe that a U.N. presence would be a valuable deterrent to such an attack. A second grave concern of mine is that the food and medical supplies provided by international relief agencies are not always being distributed to the refugees for whom they were intended.

Frequent allegations have been made that a large percentage of the supplies are being confiscated by armed factions within the camps and being distributed only to soldiers fighting for those factions. In my view, a U.N. presence at the camps would help to insure that the refugees are receiving the aid in an equitable manner.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our Government has an obligation to help put an end to the nightmare which has befallen the Kampuchean people. We must insure that adequate relief supplies are being sent to these refugees. We must continue to permit a reasonable number of refugees to enter the United States for permanent resettlement. Finally, we must work actively in the international forum for various actions which will protect the refugees from further tragedy. I believe that a U.N. presence in the camps would accomplish this last goal, and I urge my colleagues to support Senate Concurrent Resolution 72.●

● **Mr. DERWINSKI.** Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 274, an effort to save lives in an area of the world where so many have already perished. This is a measure toward rationalization of the attempts of the international community to provide for nearly a million miserable, tortured souls. There must be a more formal, more permanent, more effective international presence in the area to reinforce and surprise the humanitarian effort and stabilize the political situation along the Thai-Kampuchean border.

The threats—of all kinds—hunger, disease, human predators—which face those tortured peoples who have already endured so much, are real and insidious.

There is a hope that a regularized international humanitarian presence can save lives and ease the misery of many of the refugees in this area. The government of Thailand has requested the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees to take this step. He has not yet done so. He should. If lives can be saved, they must. If misery can be eased, it must. In an almost literal sense this area offers some respite from the Kampuchean hell. Let us do what we can to ease the misery which is the daily currency of the people in that hell.●

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURLISON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72).

The question was taken.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of Cali-

fornia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 1, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—388

Abdnor	Dellums	Howard
Addabbo	Derwinski	Hubbard
Akaka	Dickinson	Huckaby
Alexander	Dicks	Hughes
Ambro	Dingell	Hutto
Anderson,	Dodd	Hyde
Calif.	Donnelly	Ichord
Andrews, N.C.	Dougherty	Ireland
Andrews,	Downey	Jacobs
N. Dak.	Drinan	Jeffords
Annunzio	Duncan, Tenn.	Jeffries
Anthony	Early	Jenkins
Applegate	Edgar	Jenrette
Ashbrook	Edwards, Calif.	Johnson, Calif.
Ashley	Emery	Johnson, Colo.
Aspin	English	Jones, N.C.
Atkinson	Erdahl	Jones, Okla.
AuCoin	Erlenborn	Jones, Tenn.
Bafalis	Ertel	Kastenmeyer
Balley	Evans, Del.	Kelly
Baldus	Evans, Ga.	Kemp
Barnard	Evans, Ind.	Kildee
Barnes	Fary	Kindness
Bauman	Fascell	Kogovsek
Beard, R.I.	Fazio	Kostmayer
Beard, Tenn.	Fenwick	Kramer
Bedell	Ferraro	LaFalce
Bellenson	Findley	Lagomarsino
Benjamin	Fish	Latta
Bennett	Fisher	Leach, Iowa
Bereuter	Flithian	Leach, La.
Bethune	Filippo	Leath, Tex.
Bevill	Florio	Lederer
Bingham	Foley	Lee
Blanchard	Ford, Mich.	Lehman
Boggs	Ford, Tenn.	Leland
Boland	Forsythe	Lent
Boiling	Fountain	Levitas
Bonior	Fowler	Livingston
Bonker	Frenzel	Lloyd
Bouquard	Fuqua	Loeffler
Bowen	Garcia	Long, La.
Brademas	Gaydos	Long, Md.
Breaux	Gephardt	Lott
Brinkley	Gibbons	Lowry
Brodhead	Gilman	Lujan
Brooks	Gingrich	Luken
Broomfield	Ginn	Lundine
Brown, Calif.	Glickman	Lungren
Broyhill	Goldwater	McClory
Buchanan	Gonzalez	McCormack
Burgener	Goodling	McDade
Burlison	Gore	McEwen
Burton, John	Gradison	McHugh
Burton, Phillip	Gramm	McKay
Butler	Grassley	McKinney
Byron	Gray	Madigan
Campbell	Green	Maguire
Carney	Grisham	Markley
Carr	Guarini	Marks
Carter	Gudger	Marlenee
Cavanaugh	Hagedorn	Marriott
Chappell	Hall, Ohio	Martin
Clausen	Hall, Tex.	Matsui
Clay	Hamilton	Mattox
Clinger	Hammer-	Mavroules
Coelho	schmidt	Mazzoli
Coleman	Hance	Mica
Collins, Ill.	Hanley	Michel
Collins, Tex.	Hansen	Mikulski
Conable	Harkin	Miller, Ohio
Conte	Harris	Mineta
Corcoran	Harsha	Minish
Corman	Hawkins	Mitchell, Md.
Cotter	Heckler	Mitchell, N.Y.
Coughlin	Hefner	Moakley
Courter	Heftel	Moffett
Crane, Daniel	Hightower	Mollohan
D'Amours	Hillis	Montgomery
Daniel, Dan	Hinson	Moorhead,
Daniel, R. W.	Holland	Calif.
Danielson	Hollenbeck	Moorhead, Pa.
Dannmeyer	Holt	Mottl
Daschle	Holtzman	Murphy, N.Y.
de la Garza	Hopkins	Murphy, Pa.
Deckard	Horton	Murtha

Myers, Ind.	Roth	Tauke
Myers, Pa.	Roybal	Taylor
Natcher	Royer	Thomas
Neal	Rudd	Thompson
Nedzi	Runnels	Traxler
Nelson	Russo	Treen
Nichols	Sabo	Trible
Nowak	Satterfield	Udall
O'Brien	Sawyer	Ullman
Oakar	Scheuer	Van Deerlin
Oberstar	Schroeder	Vento
Obey	Schulze	Volkmer
Ottinger	Sebelius	Walgren
Panetta	Selberling	Walker
Pashayan	Sensenbrenner	Wampler
Patten	Shannon	Watkins
Patterson	Sharp	Wayman
Paul	Shelby	Weaver
Pease	Shumway	Weiss
Perkins	Shuster	White
Petri	Simon	Whitehurst
Peyser	Skelton	Whitley
Pickle	Slack	Whittaker
Porter	Smith, Iowa	Whitten
Preyer	Smith, Nebr.	Williams, Mont.
Price	Snowe	Williams, Ohio
Pritchard	Snyder	Willson, Bob
Pursell	Solarz	Wilson, C. H.
Quayle	Solomon	Wilson, Tex.
Quillen	Spellman	Winn
Rahall	Spence	Wirth
Rallsback	St Germain	Wolfe
Rangel	Stack	Wolpe
Regula	Staggers	Wright
Reuss	Stangeland	Wyatt
Rhodes	Stanton	Wydler
Richmond	Stark	Wyllie
Rinaldo	Stenholm	Yates
Ritter	Stokes	Yatron
Roberts	Stratton	Young, Alaska
Robinson	Studds	Young, Fla.
Roe	Stump	Young, Mo.
Rose	Swift	Zablocki
Rosenthal	Symms	Zerferetti
Rostenkowski	Synar	

## NAYS—1

McDonald

## NOT VOTING—44

Albosta	Devine	Miller, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.	Diggs	Moore
Archer	Dixon	Murphy, Ill.
Badham	Dornan	Nolan
Blaggi	Duncan, Oreg.	Pepper
Boner	Eckhardt	Ratchford
Brown, Ohio	Edwards, Ala.	Rodino
Cheney	Edwards, Okla.	Rousselot
Chisholm	Frost	Santini
Cleveland	Gialmo	Steed
Conyers	Guyer	Stewart
Crane, Philip	Kazen	Stockman
Davis, Mich.	Lewis	Vander Jagt
Davis, S.C.	McCloskey	Vanik
Derrick	Mathis	

## □ 1240

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Harsha.  
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Devine.  
 Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Moore.  
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Rousselot.  
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.  
 Mr. Rodino with Mr. Philip M. Crane.  
 Mr. Santini with Mr. Cleveland.  
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.  
 Mr. Vanik with Mr. Stockman.  
 Mr. Mathis with Mr. Vander Jagt.  
 Mr. Kazen with Mr. Badham.  
 Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Brown of Ohio.  
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Cheney.  
 Mr. Conyers with Mr. Davis of Michigan.  
 Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Dornan.  
 Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Derrick.  
 Mr. Nolan with Mr. Frost.  
 Mr. Boner of Tennessee with Mr. Albosta.  
 Mr. Dixon with Mr. Eckhardt.  
 Mr. Lewis with Mr. McCloskey.  
 Mr. Stewart with Mr. Guyer.  
 Mr. Ratchford with Mr. Edwards of Oklahoma.

Mr. LUJAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor

thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## □ 1250

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWIFT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL CENTRAL AMERICAN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1979

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6081) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize assistance in support of peaceful and democratic processes of development in Central America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI). The motion was agreed to.

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 6081, with Mr. FOLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Monday, February 25, the bill had been considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we stand at an important crossroads in our ties with the Nicaraguan people and millions more throughout Central America. Let me express a few personal observations as to how things came to pass in Nicaragua and where we might go from here.

First, our earnest desire to prevent the spread of communism in Latin America continues to be too often construed as callous opposition to legitimate popular rebellions against injustice and oppression simply because the targets of such popular rebellions, like Anastasio Somoza, say they are Communist-inspired or Communist-directed, or even because some self-professed Communists take part in them. This recurring misperception on our part has tragically resulted in our Nation being put in the position of perpetuating undemocratic regimes that do not even enjoy the support of the people they govern.

Second, it is very presumptuous for any Member of this House to predict what course the new government and Nicaraguan society will take in the months and years ahead. Who, in 1865, could have foreseen that it would take

nearly 100 years after the conclusion of our own civil war before the Congress would enact laws guaranteeing for all Americans equal access to public facilities and the right to vote?

As for the threat of communism in Nicaragua, Somoza and his supporters are to blame every bit as much as the Sandinistas, if not more so. Just as Batista set the stage for Castro's revolution, Somoza with his greed, corruption, and dictatorial rule sowed the seeds for violent civil war in Nicaragua and the advent of the Sandinistas.

Third, looking to the future, the surest way to frustrate the Cuban ideologies and their Nicaraguan sympathizers is to preempt their appeal. The same holds true for the cadres of Marxists inside El Salvador and Guatemala. Rather than decrying the presence of 500 Cuban doctors in Nicaragua and threatening to withhold aid, we ought to be offering to help train 1,000 Nicaraguans or more in American medical schools and offering to help train thousands of Nicaraguan teachers, engineers, and farmers at the same time.

Fourth, it is by pressing long-overdue social reforms and not with guns that we can most effectively fight totalitarian extremists of the left or right in Central America and elsewhere. If we continue to allow communism to carry the banner of reform, then the downtrodden and the dispossessed, the exploited and the neglected, will turn to it as the only way out of their misery. Our task is to find constructive ways in which to associate our Nation with the forces of change.

Now is the time to challenge the political and economic oligarchies such as the Somoza dynasty which dominated Nicaragua for nearly 40 years—and those regimes which persist in El Salvador and Guatemala and elsewhere—to commit themselves to real egalitarian and economic reforms. For example, we can seize the moment to press for meaningful land reform. At the time of his downfall, Anastasio Somoza was widely reputed to own 60 percent of all the arable land in Nicaragua. In El Salvador, 57 percent of the land is owned by only 1.9 percent of the population. And in Guatemala, 66 percent of the land is owned by 2.6 percent of the population.

Land reform is the essence of human dignity and democracy in Central America. To give land to the man who works it is to give him, for the first time, a degree of security—something more than subsistence living, a place to stand for his rights as a citizen, a share and a stake in the society of which he is a part. Recall for a moment what Daniel Webster said on this point in 1820:

The freest government, if it could exist, would not be long acceptable, if the tendency of the laws was to create a rapid accumulation of property in few hands, and to render the great mass of the population dependent and penniless. Universal suffrage, for example, could not long exist in a community where there was great inequality of property.

It is too early to draw any conclusions about what the Sandinistas intend in the way of land reform. The simple truth of the matter is that if we had been concerned about land reform earlier, the



Sandinistas might not be where they are today.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RICHMOND). The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PEASE) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PEASE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, in the early 1960's, the Alliance for Progress was born out of a pledge of nonviolent revolutionary change. It proposed an end to the closed society, a society which reserves all wealth and power and privilege for the same classes and the same families which have possessed that wealth and power for centuries. If we had not strayed from that purpose, we would not be confronting such difficult choices in Nicaragua today.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEASE. I would be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman advise the committee how much of the land that has been expropriated by the Sandinista government has been distributed to peasants?

Mr. PEASE. I do not have those figures in my hand.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Well, that is understandable, because we have been advised by the Minister for Agrarian Reform that none has and that there is no intention of doing so in the near future.

Mr. PEASE. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. I would just point out again as I did in my remarks that it took the Congress nearly a hundred years to fulfill some of the civil rights that we thought we had guaranteed in the civil war. It may take the Sandinistas a little longer, too.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PEASE) has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PEASE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEASE. I am happy to yield to my chairman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In response to the question of the gentleman from California it is my understanding that they are now in the process of creating a land reform policy.

As a matter of fact, I might say to the gentleman from California, a team of land tenure experts from the University of Wisconsin has been in Nicaragua and will return to Nicaragua to study the problems involved in land reform. This will insure a U.S. input into the land reform process.

□ 1300

This is a further example of why it is necessary that we pass this legislation to make it possible for other United States teams of experts to go to Nicaragua. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PEASE. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG of Florida: On page 3, strike lines 23 through 25, and on page 4, strike lines 1 through 7 and insert in lieu thereof:

"(f) The President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, certification prior to releasing any assistance to the Government of Nicaragua under this chapter, that the Government of Nicaragua has not cooperated with or harbors any international terrorist organization or is aiding, abetting, or supporting acts of violence or terrorism in other countries. In the event that the President transmits such a certification, but at a later date he determines that the Government of Nicaragua cooperates with or harbors any international terrorist organization or is aiding, abetting, or supporting acts of violence or terrorism in other countries, the President shall terminate assistance to the Government of Nicaragua under this chapter and the outstanding balance of any loan to the Government of Nicaragua, or any of its agencies or instrumentalities, with funds authorized to be appropriated by this chapter shall become immediately due and payable."

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have thought long and hard about this issue of aid to Nicaragua. I would like to say to my friend from Wisconsin and all of the House that I have decided that I am willing to spend \$75 million if we can be assured that this will stop the spread of communism in the Caribbean area and the Central American area through Nicaragua by Cuba or by anyone else. And in order to assure myself that is not going to happen, that we are not going to be, in fact, helping to finance the spread of communism through Nicaragua to El Salvador, for example, I offer this amendment.

The way the bill reads, the President would be required to terminate any assistance to Nicaragua if that Government cooperates with, or harbors any international terrorist organization, or is aiding, abetting, or supporting acts of violence or terrorism in other countries.

Now, my amendment would change it around just slightly to say that prior to the time that the President would release those funds he would certify to Congress and the respective committees in the House and Senate that the Government of Nicaragua has not cooperated with or harbors any international terrorist organization, or is aiding, abetting, or supporting acts of violence or terrorism in other countries. It is a very simple amendment. Have the President certify to the Congress that Nicaragua is not doing these things, and then he can go ahead and release the money. Then I think we could be somewhat assured that our taxpayers' dollars are not going to be used in exporting communism from Cuba or from any place else through Nicaragua to El Salvador or some other part of the Central American part of the world.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would ask the Chairman how much time I have left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 3 minutes left.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the Chair and I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I read the gentleman's amendment, it is identical to the language that is already contained in the bill on page 3, subparagraph (f), except for a report on the part of the President to the Congress; is that not correct?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Not exactly, no. The language in the bill says the President shall terminate assistance, and my language says that the President will not release the funds until he has made that certification that Nicaragua is not involved in the exporting of this violence or these other activities as mentioned in the bill. The language is the same except mine is a prior notification and the bill requires a termination if he decides that is what is happening.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Will the gentleman yield further?

(By unanimous consent Mr. YOUNG of Florida was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman will yield briefly, if the gentleman's interpretation is accurate, we on this side see no problem with accepting the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy with the words of the gentleman from Wisconsin, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleasantly surprised at the momentary support this amendment has from the majority side of the aisle. I say momentary because quite often amendments are accepted in the House, and when they go to conference they are lost. I am sure that an overwhelming expression of support for this amendment dealing with possible terrorism in Nicaragua being exported to other countries, I am sure an expression of strong support for this amendment of the House would prevent it from being taken out in the conference.

I think it is absolutely essential that this legislation guarantee that American taxpayers' dollars, \$75 million in this instance, will not be spent to allow the Government of Nicaragua, as this amendment says, to cooperate with or harbor any international terrorist organization, or to permit them, to aid, abet, or support acts of violence or terrorism in other countries. The amendment the gentleman from Florida has offered requires the President to certify before \$1 of this aid goes into Nicaragua that this is not happening now.

Now, I happen to believe, based on the knowledge that I have, press reports and my own discussions with a number of people in recent weeks, that the Government of Nicaragua is, in fact, engaged at this time in assisting terrorists operations. I think they are presently engaged directly in attempting to overthrow the Government of El Salvador in which they seem to have the complicity and support of the State Department of the United States, in view of a statement of Ambassador White to El Salvador

and others. I happen to believe they are intimately cooperating with the Cuban Government and this is all part of a larger plan to subvert Latin America that has been on record publicly for some years, a plan that was first announced in 1959 by Fidel Castro when he took power in Cuba.

Only a few days ago in the Washington Star Henry Bradsher wrote a lengthy article quoting unnamed U.S. specialists who deal with the Latin American region. In that article he interestingly enough laid out precisely what I have just described, how after Somoza left and the Sandinistas took over, that Cuba, in partnership with the Sandinistas, would be looking toward other targets. Their immediate target is El Salvador and, after that, Guatemala, and Honduras. I think it is very significant that this question has been raised and now even the majority is willing to address it in the form of this amendment. We hope that we will give them the chance to vote in favor of this amendment that will allow us to place proper restrictions on the aid, because I do not think any Member of this House would want American money going to aid terrorism. I think it is particularly apt we should apply such a restriction, and I applaud the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I would say to the gentleman these kinds of amendments sound all right and everything, and I know the gentleman from Maryland prides himself on being consistent, and I am just wondering if the gentleman from Maryland, when further aid bills come up in the House later on this spring for aid to, let us say, some of the Arab countries, if perhaps we might not have the same kind of amendment applied to them, because a lot of those countries do, in fact, harbor PLO international terrorists. Perhaps we should have this kind of amendment for that and for Arab countries, too. I wonder if the gentleman would support that?

Mr. BAUMAN. I subscribe to the same cardinal principle the gentleman from Iowa seems to subscribe to, and that is I am always consistent when it is convenient. I will reserve my judgment on each one of the countries as they come up.

But I will say if the gentleman is concerned about Arab terrorism and the PLO, he certainly should be for this amendment, because the government of Nicaragua has embraced the PLO, has endorsed the PLO, and has issued statements saying they are in communion and union with the Palestine Liberation Organization, and I am opposed to such terrorism.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to add my very strong support to this amendment and I am pleased the majority has seen fit to endorse it as well. I think it

is very important this House go on record in support of this amendment so it will be plain to the Members of the other body that we feel very strongly about it.

□ 1310

I for one fail to see, however, how the President is going to be able to make certification. If he can make it that will be fine.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG.)

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 76]

Abdnor	Carr	Fithian
Addabbo	Carter	Filippo
Akaka	Cavanaugh	Florio
Albosta	Cheney	Foley
Alexander	Chisholm	Ford, Mich.
Ambro	Clausen	Ford, Tenn.
Anderson, Calif.	Clay	Forsythe
Andrews	Clinger	Fountain
N. Dak.	Coleman	Fowler
Annunzio	Collins, Ill.	Frenzel
Anthony	Collins, Tex.	Fuqua
Applegate	Conable	Garcla
Ashbrook	Conte	Gardos
Ashley	Corcoran	Gephardt
Aspin	Corman	Gibbons
Atkinson	Cotter	Gilman
AuCoin	Coughlin	Gingerich
Badham	Courter	Ginn
Bafalis	Crane, Daniel	Glickman
Bailey	D'Amours	Gonzalez
Baldus	Daniel, Dan	Goodling
Barnard	Daniel, R. W.	Gore
Barnes	Danielson	Gradison
Bauman	Dannemeyer	Gamm
Beard, R.I.	Daschle	Grassley
Beard, Tenn.	Davis, Mich.	Gray
Bedell	de la Garza	Green
Belenson	Deckard	Graham
Benjamin	Dellums	Guarini
Bennett	Derrick	Guider
Bereuter	Derwinski	Guyser
Bethune	Dickinson	Faceyorn
Bevill	Dicks	Hall, Ohio
Bingham	Dodd	Hall, Tex.
Bo and	Donnelly	Hamilton
Bolling	Dougherty	Hammerschmidt
Bonior	Downey	Hance
Bonior	Dinan	Hanley
Bouquard	Duncan, Tenn.	Hansen
Bowen	Early	Harkin
Brademas	Edgar	Harris
Breaux	Edwards, Calif.	Haskler
Brinkley	Emery	Hefner
Brooks	English	Hefner
Broomfield	Erdahl	Hefner
Brown, Calif.	Erenborn	Hefner
Brownhill	Ertel	Hightower
Buchanan	Evans, Del.	Hinson
Burgener	Evans, Ind.	Holland
Burlison	Fary	Hollenbeck
Burton, John	Farrell	Holt
Burton, Phillip	Fenwick	Hookins
Butler	Ferraro	Horton
Bvorn	Findley	Howard
Campbell	Fisher	Hubbard
Carney	Fisher	Huckaby
		Hutto

Hyde	Mitchell, N.Y.	Shannon
Ireland	Moakley	Sharp
Jacobs	Mollohan	Shelby
Jeffords	Montgomery	Shumway
Jeffries	Moorhead, Calif.	Shuster
Jenkins	Moorehead, Pa.	Skelton
Jenrette	Mottl	Sack
Johnson, Calif.	Murphy, N.Y.	Smith, Iowa
Johnson, Colo.	Murphy, Pa.	Smith, Nebr.
Jones, N.C.	Murtha	Snowe
Jones, Tenn.	Myers, Ind.	Snyder
Kastenmeyer	Myers, Pa.	Solarz
Kazen	Natcher	Solomon
Kelly	Neal	Spence
Kemp	Nedzi	St Germain
Kildee	Nelson	Stack
Kogovsek	Nichols	Stangeland
Kosmayer	Nowak	Stanton
Kramer	O'Brien	Stark
LaFalce	Oaker	Steed
LaGomarsino	Oberstar	Stenholm
Leach, Iowa	Obey	Stewart
Leach, La.	Oettinger	Stokes
Leath, Tex.	Panetta	Stratton
Lederer	Pashayan	Studds
Lee	Patten	Stump
Lehman	Patterson	Swift
Leland	Paul	Symms
Lent	Pease	Synar
Levitas	Perkins	Tauke
Lewis	Petri	Taylor
Livingston	Peyser	Thomas
Lloyd	Pickle	Thompson
Loeffler	Porter	Traxler
Long, La.	Preyer	Tribble
Long, Md.	Price	Udall
Lott	Pritchard	Ullman
Lowry	Pursell	Van Deelen
Lujan	Quayle	Vento
Lutken	Quillen	Volkmer
Lundine	Rahall	Walgren
Lungren	Rallsback	Walker
McClory	Rangel	Wampler
McCormack	Regula	Watkins
McDade	Reuss	Waxman
McDonald	Rhodes	Weaver
McEwen	Richmond	Weiss
McHugh	Rinaldo	Whitehurst
McKay	Ritter	Whitley
McKinney	Roberts	Whittaker
Madigan	Robinson	Whitten
Maruire	Rodino	Williams, Mont.
Markey	Roe	Williams, Ohio
Marks	Rose	Wilson, Bob
Marlenee	Rosenthal	Wilson, Tex.
Marriott	Rostenkowski	Winn
Martin	Roth	Wirth
Mathis	Roybal	Wolf
Matsui	Royce	Wolpe
Mattox	Rudd	Wright
Mavroules	Runnels	Wyatt
Mazzoli	Russo	Wyder
Mica	Sabo	Yates
Michel	Sawyer	Yatron
Mikulski	Schroeder	Young, Fla.
Miller, Calif.	Schulze	Young, Mo.
Miller, Ohio	Sebelius	Zablocki
Mineta	Seiberling	Zeferetti
M'n'sh	Sensenbrenner	
Mitchell, Md.		

□ 1320

The CHAIRMAN. Three hundred and seventy-five Members have answered to their name, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) for a recorded vote. Five minutes will be allowed for the vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 392, noes 3, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

AYES—392

Abdnor	Andrews	Atkinson
Addabbo	N. Dak.	AuCoin
Akaka	Annunzio	Badham
Albosta	Anthony	Bafalis
Alexander	Applegate	Bailey
Ambro	Archer	Baldus
Anderson	Ashbrook	Barnard
Calif.	Aspin	Barnes
Andrews, N.C.		Bauman



Beard, R.I.  
Beard, Tenn.  
Bedell  
Bellenson  
Benjamin  
Bennett  
Bereuter  
Bethune  
Bevill  
Bingham  
Bianchard  
Boggs  
Boiland  
Bolling  
Bonior  
Bonker  
Bouquard  
Bowen  
Brademas  
Breau  
Brinkley  
Brodhead  
Brooks  
Broomfield  
Broyhill  
Buchanan  
Burgener  
Burlison  
Burton, John  
Burton, Phillip  
Butler  
Byron  
Campbell  
Carney  
Carr  
Carter  
Cavanaugh  
Chappell  
Cheney  
Chisholm  
Clausen  
Clay  
Clinger  
Coelho  
Coleman  
Collins, Ill.  
Collins, Tex.  
Conable  
Conte  
Corcoran  
Corman  
Cotter  
Coughlin  
Courter  
Crane, Daniel  
D'Amours  
Daniel, Dan  
Daniel, R. W.  
Danielson  
Dannemeyer  
Daschle  
Davis, Mich.  
de la Garza  
Deckard  
Dellums  
Derrick  
Derwinski  
Dickinson  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dodd  
Donnelly  
Dougherty  
Downey  
Drinan  
Duncan, Tenn.  
Early  
Edgar  
Edwards, Calif.  
Emery  
English  
Erdahl  
Erlenborn  
Ertel  
Evans, Del.  
Evans, Ga.  
Evans, Ind.  
Fary  
Fascell  
Fazio  
Fenwick  
Ferraro  
Findley  
Fish  
Fisher  
Fithian  
Flippo  
Florio  
Foley  
Ford, Mich.  
Ford, Tenn.  
Forsythe  
Fountain  
Fowler

Frenzel  
Fugua  
Garcia  
Gaydos  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Ginn  
Glickman  
Goldwater  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Gore  
Gradison  
Gramm  
Grassley  
Gray  
Green  
Grisham  
Guarini  
Gudger  
Guyer  
Hagedorn  
Hall, Ohio  
Hall, Tex.  
Hamilton  
Hammer  
Hanschmidt  
Hance  
Hanley  
Hansen  
Harkin  
Harris  
Harsha  
Hawkins  
Heckler  
Hefner  
Heftel  
Hightower  
Hinson  
Holland  
Hollenbeck  
Holt  
Holtzman  
Hopkins  
Horton  
Howard  
Hubbard  
Huckaby  
Hughes  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Ireland  
Jacobs  
Jeffords  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Jennette  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, Colo.  
Jones, N.C.  
Jones, Okla.  
Jones, Tenn.  
Kastenmeier  
Kazen  
Kelly  
Kemp  
Kildee  
Kindness  
Kogovsek  
Kostmayer  
Kramer  
LaFalce  
Lagomarsino  
Latta  
Leach, Iowa  
Leach, La.  
Leath, Tex.  
Lederer  
Lee  
Lehman  
Leland  
Lent  
Levitas  
Lewis  
Livingston  
Lloyd  
Loeffler  
Long, La.  
Long, Md.  
Lott  
Lowry  
Lujan  
Luken  
Lundine  
Lungren  
McClary  
McCormack  
McDade  
McDonald  
McEwen  
McHugh  
McKay

McKinney  
Madigan  
Maguire  
Markey  
Marks  
Marlenee  
Marriott  
Martin  
Mathis  
Matsui  
Mattox  
Mavroules  
Mazzoli  
Mica  
Michel  
Mikulski  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Ohio  
Mineta  
Minish  
Mitchell, Md.  
Mitchell, N.Y.  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead, Calif.  
Moorhead, Pa.  
Mottl  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Murphy, Pa.  
Murtha  
Myers, Ind.  
Myers, Pa.  
Natcher  
Neal  
Nedzi  
Nelson  
Nichols  
Nowak  
O'Brien  
Oakar  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Ottinger  
Panetta  
Pashayan  
Patten  
Patterson  
Paul  
Pease  
Perkins  
Petri  
Peyser  
Pickle  
Porter  
Preyer  
Price  
Pritchard  
Pursell  
Quayle  
Quillen  
Rahall  
Rallsback  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rhodes  
Richmond  
Rinaldo  
Ritter  
Roberts  
Robinson  
Rodino  
Roe  
Rose  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roybal  
Royer  
Rudd  
Runnels  
Russo  
Sabo  
Satterfield  
Sawyer  
Scheuer  
Schroeder  
Schulze  
Sebelius  
Sensenbrenner  
Shannon  
Sharp  
Shelby  
Shumway  
Shuster  
Skelton  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, Nebr.  
Snowe  
Snyder  
Solarz  
Solomon

Spellman  
Spence  
St Germain  
Stack  
Stangeland  
Stanton  
Stark  
Steed  
Stenholm  
Stewart  
Stokes  
Stratton  
Studds  
Stump  
Swift  
Symms  
Synar  
Tauke  
Taylor

## NOES—3

Brown, Calif. Reuss Seiberling

## NOT VOTING—38

Anderson, Ill. Eckhardt  
Biaggi Edwards, Ala.  
Bonner Edwards, Okla.  
Brown, Ohio Frost  
Cleveland Gialmo  
Conyers Hillis  
Crane, Philip Ichord  
Davis, S.C. McCloskey  
Devine Moffett  
Diggs Moore  
Dixon Murphy, Ill.  
Dornan Nolan  
Duncan, Oreg. Pepper

## □ 1330

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

## The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: page 4, in line 10, immediately after "States" insert ", including Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica, and Honduras,"; and

In line 11, immediately after "against" insert "terrorism and".

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, President Carter, in his October 1 speech on Soviet troops in Cuba, said:

We will increase our economic assistance to alleviate the unmet economic and human needs in the Caribbean region and further to ensure the ability of troubled peoples to resist social turmoil and possible Communist domination.

Our efforts should be directed toward reinforcing the President's stated objective of supporting our allies in Central America; we should be offering them aid instead of setting the example of giving aid to a "Marxist-dominated" regime in Nicaragua; if we are not going to offer aid in this package, the least we can do is express the sense of the Congress that the United States supports our traditional allies.

If we do not at least make some statement to that effect, we will be sending the wrong signal to our allies; that is, in order to get aid, you have to have a radical overthrow of the government and make ominous, anti-American speeches.

Mr. Chairman, let me read the entire paragraph as it would be amended by my amendment:

It is the sense of the Congress that the United States should support those traditionally faithful allies of the United States, including Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica, and Honduras, which are responsible members of the Organization of American States against terrorism and external subversion.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want anybody to think that this amendment is the product of my fertile imagination. This amendment was inspired by the words of President Carter in his October 1 speech to the Nation when he discussed the crisis created by the presence of a Soviet armed brigade in Cuba, and I quote the President now:

We will increase our economic assistance to alleviate the unmet economic and human needs in the Caribbean region and further to ensure the ability of troubled peoples to resist social turmoil and possible Communist domination.

Recognizing the strength of the President's commitment, recognizing that the basic language in this bill had administration support, I am perfecting it by specifically mentioning the four countries in Central America which I feel could be threatened by the developments in that region, namely, Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica, and Honduras.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple, practical, direct-to-the-point amendment, and I hope that my utilization of the President's language in support of it will lend some strength to it on the floor.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. It is very similar to the amendment I offered in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That amendment was turned down in favor of the more general watered-down language that appears in the bill, the language that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) just read.

## □ 1340

I think we all know what we are talking about here. The statements of the President, and others, have been about concern in the Central American area. Let us say so. Let us say what we mean. Let us let those in Nicaragua who are running that government know that we are concerned about those governments, that we do intend to do what we can to see that they survive and are able to have democratic institutions in an orderly manner brought about, and that we expect that the Nicaraguan Government will take no part in intervening with those governments.

I think if we do not make some statement to that effect, especially considering that the title of this bill is a Special Central American Assistance Act, that we are going to be sending the wrong signals to the countries that the gentleman mentioned; that is, that in order to get aid, you have to have a radical overthrow of the government and make ominous anti-American speeches.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee adopts the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows, as a member of the committee, that we do send many messages all over the world via our legislative language. But in this case the basic paragraph already refers to traditionally

faithful allies. Certainly no one would argue that Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica, and Honduras are not faithful allies. They consistently support us at the United Nations. I think this merely clarifies the intent of the Congress at this point.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I do not see anything wrong with what the gentleman proposes to do, but I wonder if the gentleman would accept the inclusion, while enumerating those friendly countries in Central America, also of Nicaragua and Panama.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Sure. That is no problem. Actually, you could add Mexico, you could go up and down the line if you want to in the area.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman would consent to a consideration of an amendment to his amendment, I would like to add Nicaragua and Panama to the list. Then I think every Member could probably support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would not only accept the amendment; I would be flattered that the majority leader would pay so much attention to my little perfecting language.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) may be amended to include, where he enumerates Central American countries, also the names of Panama and Nicaragua.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification, and then the Chair will put the unanimous consent request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, in line 10, immediately after "States" insert "", including Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Panama, and Honduras."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request that the amendment be modified as reported by the Clerk?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, just to make sure, the majority leader did not mention Belize. Did the gentleman mean by "Honduras" British Honduras, better known now as Belize? We just want to make sure we do not miss any friends. We have so few.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think it is included.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF NEW YORK

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURPHY of New York: Page 5, add the following after line 8:

"(k) (1) In furnishing assistance under this chapter to the Government of Nicaragua, the President shall take into account the right of the people of Nicaragua to self-determination through the democratic process, such right to be exercised in free national elections.

"(2) The President shall terminate assistance to the Government of Nicaragua under this chapter if he determines that a free national election has not been held in Nicaragua by December 31, 1981, under the following conditions:

"(A) The election is conducted at traditional polling and registration places.

"(B) The election is conducted without civil, military, or private interference with voting in the election.

"(C) All candidates and proponents of issues significant in the election have equal access to the broadcast media."

Page 5, line 8, strike out the closed quotation marks and second period.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to H.R. 6081, a bill "To amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize assistance in support of peaceful and democratic processes of development in Central America." The measure is aimed more specifically at what for 40 years had been our friendly neighbor to the South, Nicaragua, to enable it to recover in a democratic fashion from what the bill describes as its "recent civil strife."

My amendment supports and enhances that noble purpose. My amendment would give the people of Nicaragua free, open, and democratic elections and would tend to guarantee the dream they thought they were harboring during their recent conflict—the dream of an open, democratic society. My proposal calls for open elections supervised by international organizations before the end of 1981—the same kind of requirements imposed of the last regime by our own Government just a year ago.

My correspondence with President Carter and Secretary Vance on that point follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 22, 1979.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is to thank you for the gracious hospitality you afforded Kathy and I last Friday. We both enjoyed the opportunity to discuss with you some areas in which we are deeply interested.

Since that time I have had further information come to my attention concerning the current situation in Nicaragua. This occurred during a visit to my office on Friday afternoon by Luis Pallais, the Vice President of the Nicaraguan Congress. He and I discussed the various proposals and counter-proposals to settle the current crisis in Nicaragua made by the Organization of American States negotiating team from the Dominican Republic/Guatemala/United States and the government of Nicaragua. Over the week-end, I have studied the documents of December-January outlining the various conditions which have been proffered in the ebb and flow of the negotiations and discussed them with Mr. Pallais.

I must confess that the proposal made by the Liberal Nationalist Party of December 26, 1978, is, in my judgment, an extraordinary document in that it represents an overly concessional approach by the Nica-

raguan government to achieve a peaceful solution by giving up what are basic rights of a sovereign nation. For example, President Somoza will restrict the bulk of the National Guard, which does not vote, to its quarters for three days prior to and during the election; he will place the State Radio system under the supervision of a National Plebiscite Authority to afford equal time to the opposition to campaign; he will prohibit the use of any State resources in favor of either the PLN or the FAO; and, he will guarantee that "no civil, military or private authority will interfere with the access of citizens to the registration and voting precincts." All of the above concessions will be guaranteed by a force of international and internal supervisors. In short, the above, along with the other guarantees agreed to in the proposal of December 26, would meet the highest requirements of most reasonable men for a fair and valid plebiscite. However, the OAS team wants more in the form of five conditions which are totally unacceptable to the Government of Nicaragua. And I am sure if you consider them fully, you will agree they totally lack any of the principles of fair play.

First, the OAS negotiators demand that the registration of voters be consummated on the day the vote takes place. For anyone familiar with the situation in Nicaragua, this is absurd on its face. The average Nicaraguan does not have a social security number, or driver's license or some other ready means of identification as, for example, a United States citizen. The delays and difficulties that would result from this condition could lead to chaos. The argument that same day registration might lead to intimidation of voters is equally absurd. Such prior registration would still be under international supervision and the actual vote is a secret vote in any event.

Second, the OAS team demands that the voting ballot should constitute a simple question of yes or no on whether or not President Somoza remains in power. If the popular vote is unfavorable to the President under such conditions, the country would be, in effect, turned over to "an ad hoc political group, lacking stability and in the process of disintegration." While the latter are the words of spokesmen for the Liberal Party, I find myself in complete accord with that assessment. In my view, it would further the cause of a peaceful solution to this question if, in the event that a popular vote of the Nicaraguan people should turn out to be unfavorable to the Constitutionally defined period of the Somoza presidency, the question of presidential succession would be determined by the process provided for in the Nicaraguan constitution through the convening of a Constituent Assembly.

Third, the OAS triumvirate has demanded that President Somoza and his family leave the country weeks ahead of the election. The lack of fundamental fairness of this demand stretches credulity. How can he campaign among his people for his own re-election if he isn't in the country? (Or perhaps this is the reason his opponents want him to leave.) In any event, as a staunch supporter of human rights, Mr. President, and as one who commended President Somoza on his attempt to improve human rights in his own country, you must agree that to force President Somoza to leave his country before a vote on his stewardship of his homeland is a violation of his human rights.

Fourth, the OAS negotiators have insisted that Nicaraguans living abroad should be allowed—for the first time in Nicaraguan history—to vote. This would be supervised by persons outside of Nicaragua, without the requirement of registration which might guarantee the bona fides of such voters (and outside of the confines of the Constitution of that country). Where is the equity here?



To compare such a procedure to "absentee voting" as provided for in the United States is a total non-sequitur. Anyone familiar with the history and reasons for nationality groups living in areas other than their country of origin must recognize the inequity of such a demand. Have we—or anyone else for that matter—ever demanded that nationality groups who chose to leave the country of their origin and become citizens or expatriates in another, be given the right to vote in absentia?

And fifth, the OAS team for some obscure reason has decided to arbitrarily change the present method of the demarcation of election districts. There would appear to be no reason to change such precinct delineations which are based on population standards. However, the farmers and the "little people" of Nicaragua have known the location of the voting places for years and they might be denied an opportunity to vote if these locations are changed. And these are the people who support President Somoza. Perhaps that is the reason Somoza's opponents want them changed. Mr. President, the democratic process will not be enhanced by this oblique attempt to disenfranchise large numbers of perhaps less sophisticated voters in Nicaragua. This OAS version of the "gerrymander" should not be forced on the people of Nicaragua.

In sum, Mr. President, we are very close to a respectable solution to the current problem in Nicaragua. The United States is in a position to restore peace and total normal economic activity to this beleaguered country which has been a strong ally of ours. When some of the above arguments were presented to Mr. William Bowdler last Friday afternoon by Luis Pallais, Mr. Bowdler is reported to have said that he wished he had been aware of them prior to the 21st of December before he committed the United States to these conditions. Is it impossible for the United States to admit a mistake and change its position? Is unfairness irrevocable? If we have made a mistake based on misinformation, is it impossible for us to change? Are we that timid that we cannot convince the opposition of the unfairness of the proposals I have just outlined—and change them?

I think the answer to all of these questions is no.

I sincerely hope that you agree with me.

I stand ready to discuss these issues at any time with you, Mr. President.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. MURPHY,  
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1979.  
Hon. JOHN M. MURPHY,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: The President has asked me to reply to your letter of January 22, 1979 on the Nicaraguan situation. I have read it with special interest given my close involvement in the effort to help find a peaceful, democratic solution to that country's political crisis.

In considering the role of the international mediation group, it is important to recall that its mandate was to find a formula that the ruling Liberal Party (PLN) and the opposition groups could agree upon to resolve the Nicaraguan crisis. With this mandate, the negotiators first asked the two sides to present their views on how the difficulties might be resolved. At the same time they undertook extensive consultations with a broad cross section of Nicaraguan society of an effort to obtain more information on the nature of the crisis and what the elements of a compromise might be.

From the presentations of the PLN and the Broad Opposition Front (FAO), as well as from private consultations with individuals

and groups, the mediators found two fundamental problems which had to be addressed in the search for a solution:

A deep and generalized feeling among important sectors of Nicaraguan public opinion that the central issue in the existing crisis was whether President Somoza should continue in power; and

A profound distrust by these sectors in the established electoral procedures of the country as implemented over many years.

The proposal presented to the two sides by the mediators on December 20 sought to deal fairly with these problems. Their plan called for agreement between the PLN and the opposition, as well as for consultation with the National Guard, so that all three key groups would have been involved in the settlement. The plan, which spanned the period from the start of the plebiscite to the holding of general elections in 1981, followed constitutional procedures and required concessions from both sides. The FAO found it possible to accept the proposal; the Nicaraguan Government did not.

With respect to the conditions you mention in your letter, I would like to make these observations. In phrasing the plebiscite question, the mediators sought to deal evenhandedly and clearly with the central issue of whether President Somoza should remain in power. They discouraged efforts to elaborate the question in order not to risk confusing broad sectors of the electorate. In view of the distrust in the electoral process, the mediators made suggestions concerning registration, voting districts, officials at the polls, and a supervisory role for an international authority. At the PLN's suggestion, the mediators amended the proposal to include a national plebiscite authority. All of these features were designed to demonstrate to the voters that this election warranted their participation in the confidence that the voting would be free, secret, and fairly tabulated.

I would note that the consequences of the vote were to have been spelled out in a document which the PLN, FAO and the National Guard would have approved in advance. Should President Somoza have lost, the transitional government was to include the PLN; the National Guard was to be retained as an institution; and the proposed reform of the judicial and electoral powers was to be carried out jointly by the FAO and the PLN. Thus, while the plebiscite could have led to substantial changes, the mediators' proposal provided for orderly change with wide participation.

It is not accurate to say that the mediators proposed that President Somoza and his family leave the country weeks ahead of the election. The opposition advanced this condition, but the mediators did not accept it. What they did suggest in their December 20 proposal was that there be changes in the the National Guard prior to the plebiscite and that these include giving President Somoza's brother and son assignments abroad. No suggestion was made that any other relatives of President Somoza leave Nicaragua. With respect to the President, the mediators proposed that, in the event he lost the plebiscite, he should absent himself from the country until after the 1981 general elections, a reasonable request given the historical context. There was no suggestion that he leave prior to the plebiscite.

Your letter also comments on Ambassador Bowdler's recent conversation with Mr. Luis Pallais. In that conversation Ambassador Bowdler noted the contrast between the attitude of the government negotiators during the PLN-FAO direct talks last December and the flexibility which Mr. Pallais now indicated existed in the government's position. Ambassador Bowdler went on to observe that it was to be regretted that this flexibility had

not been demonstrated during those December conversations when all these issues were under discussion.

I appreciate your taking the time to write on this important matter affecting the peace and welfare of Nicaragua. I believe that the mediators have advanced a fair and workable solution that allows each side to compete on even terms in the plebiscite and that makes provision for continuity in government, thereby avoiding a dangerous political vacuum. We continue to hope that it will provide the foundation for a peaceful solution.

Sincerely,

Cy.

I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that my amendment is completely consistent with the other sections of H.R. 6081, as approved by the committee, in that it is designed to promote the development of democratic processes in that republic. The "findings" section of H.R. 6081, section 536(a) states:

The Congress finds that peaceful and democratic development in Central America is in the interest of the United States and of the community of American States generally, that the recent civil strife in Nicaragua has caused great human suffering and disruption to the economy of that country, and that substantial external assistance to Nicaragua is necessary to help alleviate that suffering and to promote economic recovery within a peaceful and democratic process.

I would like to see these things happen at once—elections in 1981—as they had been planned under the previous constitutional government. However, there is little to be encouraged about on that point. The promises of the Sandinist revolutionaries for a democratic society disappeared almost as rapidly as the rattle of their automatic weapons—all too many of them supplied by the United States. As the State Department has noted in its annual human rights report, the new regime has decided to postpone convening a council of state that would draft a new electoral law, and possibly a constitution. The Sandinista love of freedom and democracy burned off like a morning fog. Nicaragua's ruling junta has determined that the people are illiterate and that they are not yet ready to participate in a democracy. The junta, 9 out of 10 of them trained and educated behind the Iron Curtain, has decided that these freedom-loving native Nicaraguans are not yet ready for their own personal freedom—that it will take years before they are educated in the new ways and can be trusted to exercise their human right to self determination.

To that end, the new regime has set off on a program of education it would have the world believe is broad, all inclusive and aimed at teaching the three "R's" to the general population—the electorate. With the junta's blessing there is currently in progress in the United States a fund drive whose goal is to raise \$20 million to finance this literacy campaign—of which some \$4 million has already been raised.

So how do they start this crash "literacy campaign"? First, the junta fired some 5,000 certified teachers in the Nicaraguan school system, allegedly because they lean toward Somoza, though the world was given no reason for believing so. The principal sin of the teachers, and

the real reason for their expropriation from the Nicaraguan educational community, is that they were not educated in a Communist land, with Communist ideals and Communist aims. They were replaced by 1,200 teachers from Cuba who do have those qualifications. As those 1,200 teachers were dispatched to Nicaragua by Fidel Castro, he told them their mission was to represent "the homeland, the revolution, and socialism \* \* \* the seed you sow in the fertile land of the revolution will be extraordinarily fruitful," Castro said. In Nicaragua, the literacy campaign is directed from the top by a Marxist-dominated junta. As it stands now, the millions being raised in America—and much of it through American corporations—will be used to finance the spread of "revolution and socialism."

The problem is that none of this "education" will in any way hasten the day of free democratic elections if those elections are dependent upon wiping out the illiteracy of the electorate, because all of this "education" is aimed at that part of the population still in school—the part of the population that is not old enough to vote in the first instance. The whole thing is a sham. Congress should not have a hand in this subterfuge on the Nicaraguan people by putting its stamp of approval on an aid bill that does not provide for timely and free democratic elections in that nation.

I, personally, want to see the Nicaraguan people get all the aid and support we can give them—support of any kind. I believe that those people treasure their freedom, and much like the Afghans, they resent domination from the outside. They abhor foreign, alien philosophies. I also believe that this new politburo-type government that see Nicaragua being run by block captains and informers is aware of the resentment of the people toward the government which is denying them the right to self-determination.

To that end I believe there is more than a little truth in the comments I have heard made to the effect that if an election were held in Nicaragua today the Sandinistas would be thrown out. That is probably the best reason why no elections are scheduled, nor will they be in the near future without help from the international community. We here in Congress must do what we can to see that free and fair elections are forthcoming.

There is reason for this discontent we here about in the new Nicaragua, and the source of that discontent is the outrage of the ordinary people at what they see going on, the dreams they see being dashed. It may be that I should have raised these questions earlier, so I will raise them now. Since early last fall I have been told time and again—by people who normally travel in and out of Nicaragua—of strange goings on in the countryside. Cattle and food supplies disappearing, along with equipment, seeds, machinery, tools, fertilizers—all the things needed to rebuild a land devastated by revolution.

These are the things the Sandinistas claim are in critically short supply, the raw materials with which to build a na-

tion. And it occurred to me that little or no accounting has been given of the vast amount of supplies that have been given—in one way or another—by nations around the world to this new republic to help it get back on its feet. I have not heard much rejoicing, and less thanks for the foodstuffs and other supplies sent to the people of Nicaragua since the summer. Little credit was given where credit was due—to this or any of the other nations which came to the aid of the new government in Nicaragua—except Cuba.

And so, I have honestly wondered whether or not the aid being sent the people of Nicaragua was actually getting to the people of Nicaragua. Now, I wonder even more in view of the stories I have heard of the shuttle that is going on between Nicaragua and Cuba. If I can believe the businessmen and others who normally travel in that country, I can easily conclude that the new Nicaragua is being systematically picked clean by its new rulers who send the food, equipment, and capital goods—sometimes directly without unpacking—to Cuba. Cuba, in return, ships to Nicaragua sugar cane, rum, educational material, and arms. Guns for butter. In view of the professed need for food and equipment, I found the information hard to believe. However, this is the way recent testimony concluded with a person who travels extensively in Nicaragua.

Q. Now tell me again. What is Cuba shipping to Nicaragua, and why?

A. They are shipping sugar and sugar cane, some tobacco, books and stuff for school, and weapons. The sugar will eventually be sold in the U.S., and maybe some tobacco. Someone will pay for the books. . . .

Q. And what is Nicaragua shipping to Cuba, and why?

A. Cattle and breeding stock, grains and seeds, cars, buses, trucks, private airplanes, fertilizer, young tobacco plants and children. They are taking our best children to educate in Cuba. They seem to be short on everything there.

I found that hard to believe, but a few weeks later from an intelligence source I learned that the famous tobacco fields of Cuba have been depleted over the last 20 years through lack of fertilizer, and their tobacco production is threatened by a deadly blight. Nicaragua is being robbed of its means of production.

In the absence of any contradictory information, I have no reason to believe these things are not true. Our own Government has provided Congress with no guidance on the distribution of the goods we have supplied the new government of Nicaragua. And, I understand, Spain registered a complaint with Nicaragua when some of its relief supplies showed up in Cuba—still in the original crates.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that if we have been less than vigilant with other aid and supplies we have given to Nicaragua since the revolution, we should not do the same thing again. If, as our legislation finds here today, it is in our interest to promote the development of democratic processes in that republic, then my amendment could provide this Congress with what it has in mind.

There are a number of other provisions

of H.R. 6081 which should be spoken to since the revolutionary government in Nicaragua—government by fiat—is still denying its citizens the rudimentary access to government normally accorded those in an organized society. Human rights are being ignored, as is freedom of the press as we understand it. The freedom of labor to organize and bargain collectively, the rights to political pluralism, the right to assembly and other basic human rights to date have been generally ignored. They are being treated just as high-handedly as is the freedom to a non-Communist education.

Section 536(f) of this bill says the President shall "terminate assistance to the Government of Nicaragua under this chapter if he determines that the Government of Nicaragua cooperates with or harbors any international organization or is aiding, abetting, or supporting acts of violence or terrorism in other countries," unless we are to presume this type of activity is going to stop the moment we take a vote here today. I suspect the President will be called upon immediately to suspend the aid. Sandinista night fighters regularly cross into Honduras and raid Nicaraguan refugee camps along the borders, killing women and children and attempting to capture what they believe to be former members of the Nicaraguan National Guard. It has caused repeated international incidents, both with Honduras and Guatemala. There is sound reason to believe that Nicaraguan-trained guerrillas have been causing mischief in both Costa Rica and El Salvador. These camps by the way house 8,000 refugees.

Lest my colleagues forget, it was not long ago that the Sandinistas, in effect, thumbed its collective nose at Congress by taking the life of one of the most renowned leaders in the Nicaraguan Army—Commandant Bravo. He was educated and received his military training in U.S. Army camps. He appeared here in Congress after the revolution to warn of the terror overtaking his country. Through a congressional effort, some 30 tons of food and medical supplies were gathered to ease the pain and suffering of Nicaraguan refugees who had fled to neighboring countries.

When other means were not available to deliver the supplies, Commandant Bravo volunteered to take the supplies to the border camps in Honduras and distribute them. Two days after he landed in Honduras he was kidnaped, tortured, mutilated, and killed by Sandinista assassins. And they bragged about it.

These are some of the realities this legislation will have to deal with. These are just some of the facts we are confronted with here today. I believe that the first best step Congress can take is to do what we can to guarantee free elections in Nicaragua at the earliest practical date. In doing so, we will be saving ourselves and our Latin American allies a mountain of grief.

I include at this point in the Record a series of documents related to the liquidation of former national guard officers and their families by the Nicaraguan Marxists and evidence of their strong ties to Communist Cuba:



STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN M. MURPHY AT A PRESS CONFERENCE ON NICARAGUA, AUGUST 1, 1979

Ladies and gentlemen: As we proceed here today I will inevitably be asked to explain the purpose of this press conference. Therefore, I will answer that question first.

Since the surrender of the Nicaraguan National Guard it appears that the Marxist-led Sandinistas have embarked on a program to systematically execute thousands of members of the Nicaraguan National Guard. The witnesses here today estimate that upwards of 3,000 of the guard have been liquidated with the killing proceeding on a daily basis.

This is being done despite promises by officials of the U.S. Government to the guard leadership that this would not happen and that their troops would be treated under the rules of the Geneva Convention.

The Red Cross, which offered its compounds as havens of asylum, have in at least one instance, had these compounds turned into death camps. At best, the guardsmen and their families who were promised protection were the victims of a cruel joke. Instead of safe havens, these compounds have turned into collection centers for the Sandinistas to more easily round up their prey.

It seems like an uneven bargain we have struck. The United States was instrumental in turning over Nicaragua to a handful of Marxist-led, Cuban trained insurgents—many of them foreigners—for a few concessions to human rights for the beleaguered members of the duly elected government. Simple things like safe passage, freedom from persecution and observance of the Geneva Convention's rules of warfare. But after the exchange was made, the Sandinistas in the classic pattern of Communist takeovers have forgotten their part of the bargain.

To much of the world it is a comic scene, if it weren't so sad, reminiscent of the tiny mahout in India riding on the back of a giant elephant and ordering him about at will. America, the elephant, is being jerked about by a handful of revolutionaries like the mahout digging at the ear of the elephant with his little hook.

The point of affording the people in this room an opportunity to speak to the Congress and the American press today is to provide them a forum to call upon the American Government—as an interested party—to conduct an immediate investigation of war crimes now being committed in Nicaragua. If this so-called people's revolution is typical of past Communist takeovers, then we do not want another Katyn Forest, Cuba, Cambodia or South Vietnam.

What war crimes? You have some of them detailed here today, in large part by eyewitnesses. In addition to apparent planned executions, allegations of widespread acts of wanton brutality and needless violence are also detailed in the affidavits which have been placed on the press table. The wives and relatives of national guardsmen and others have provided these statements for this press conference and the actual notarized, sworn documents in Spanish are also available on the table.

You can read first-hand accounts of the F.S.L.N. torture of Lieutenant Juan Ocon who was subsequently shot. Then, while still alive, he was decapitated. Unable to find his head, the family interred his remains with a plaster head in place.

There is the story of Alvaro Sanches who was taken out of his home and shot in the presence of his mother and his children. This affidavit was submitted by Maria Antonio Guido, whose "only fault" along with her husband, was that they were members of the liberal party and they owned two radio stations that transmitted liberal party news.

And the story of Pedro Pablo Espinoza, newspaperman, writer, and member of the Liberal party, who was captured at El Do-

rado, tortured, and then had his eyes pulled out before he was shot and buried in the town park with 20 other executed persons.

You can read case after case of innocent people including children being dragged from their homes, doused with gasoline and burned to death before the eyes of their families.

At the stadium in Leon the F.S.L.N. summarily executed 13 soldiers who had surrendered. There are other tales of whole families of members of the national guard being murdered in their homes. For more than a year it has been the policy of the Sandinista terrorists to assassinate all families of guardia troops, including infant children. Thus, according to the affidavit of Gladys de Ruiz, while Lieutenant Rene Silva from Matagalpa was at the battle front, "the Sandinistas went to his house and killed his wife and his two children, 4 and 2 years old."

Ms. Ruiz, the widow of a guard captain, has sworn that the general director of customs, Dr. Rafael Saavedra, was burned alive by the Sandinistas and his two sons murdered.

Within the last 48 hours, thousands of former national guard troops have been taken from their families in Red Cross centers and marched to special camps for reasons that can only be imagined, since the radio, television and press have been taken over by the new government and reports from the country are either non-existent or heavily censored. News of these things reaching the outside world is of no value to the Sandinistas at this point. It serves no useful purpose to have the world know of Red Robin Hood's war crimes. And so this forum is the next best thing available to inform the American public and this Government of the truth until the curtain that has been drawn around that former republic is pulled aside.

What the Sandinistas have done was against Nicaraguan law.

It would be against United States law were it to happen here.

It is against international law and it is certainly against God's law.

I believe the American people, and the people of the free world, have a right to know the truth of what is happening in Nicaragua, even as we speak. And I believe that the high standards of human rights that this administration has applied to our friends in the world should certainly apply to the Communists.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 1, 1979]  
LATIN DOMINOES

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

A few hours before President Carter declared over prime-time television July 24 that "I do not attribute at all the change in Nicaragua to Cuba," teletype wires into the Pentagon clattered out another link in the chain of evidence to the contrary.

The pilot of a U.S. Air Force C130 in Managua that day transmitted to Washington this most interesting travel note: Members of the Sandinista junta governing Nicaragua were seen piling into a Cubana Airlines plane enroute to Havana.

A few days earlier, a U.S. intelligence report teletyped into Washington reported an even more fascinating detail. A ranking official of DGI—the Cuban secret police—played a key role in masterminding the Sandinista takeover. Julian Lopez, DGI's chief of covert operations for Costa Rica, was present in the Sandinista command bunker (located over the border in Costa Rica) during the height of Nicaraguan fighting.

This buttressed a detailed CIA report of May 2 on Cuban military aid to the Sandinistas. It also fits another piece of intelligence that the Carter administration has not publicized: Command elements of a Soviet brigade have been introduced into Cuba. In addition, some 2,000 Soviet military person-

nel—brigade-sized, though there is no information that they are formed into an organic military unit—are in Cuba.

While intensification of Soviet-Cuban interests in the Caribbean is either ignored or overlooked by Jimmy Carter, its meaning is well understood by his own professional analysts in national security and intelligence: Central America is going red. Only the time, not the eventual outcome, is in question, unless there is a reversal of U.S. policy.

Specifically, the president's most sophisticated advisers do not doubt that, sooner or later, the Sandinista regime will be overtly communist. Present cordiality from Managua is, like Fidel Castro's smiles in 1959, an effort to shake down Uncle Sam before the true colors are shown.

Nor is there any doubt about what's next on the agenda: extension of the Soviet-Cuban thrust into El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras over an undefined but probably protracted period. However slowly, Central American dominoes are falling.

Havana's aims were described July 20 by Ramon Sanchez, Cuba's top envoy to Washington in an exposition of chilling candor that has received too little attention. He told a breakfast sponsored by Foreign Policy magazine that Cuba will send aid "of all sorts"—including weapons—to guerrillas in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras just as it had in Nicaragua.

Sanchez issued no denials about Soviet military reinforcements in Cuba. Ties between Moscow and Havana, Castro's man in Washington proclaimed, "will continue to increase in all fields, including military collaboration."

Tomas Borges, interior minister and Marxist strongman of the Nicaraguan junta, has been similarly candid, in leaflets that appeared in Honduras immediately after the Sandinista victory. Borges promised to join forces "with the revolutionary organizations of Latin America" and hailed "development of the Central American revolution." On the leaflet's first page, a photo shows Borges in Havana with Castro.

Panicky leaders in the targeted Central American countries fix U.S. visitors with one question: Will you help us? One indirect reply came from Carter July 24 when he said, "We worked as closely as we could without intervening in the internal affairs of Nicaraguans" to let them decide "what form of government they should have."

In that, Carter administration policy was decidedly interventionist against Anastasio Somoza's regime and for the Sandinistas. U.S. pressure stopped military aid for Somoza's National Guard from Israel and Guatemala. U.S. officials refused to supply weapons to the National Guard even in return for Somoza's resignation. The National Guard ultimately gave up, not for a lack of will but for a lack of arms.

The rationale for Carter's policy is the view, long cherished by revisionists, that Castro, Ho Chi Minh, Mao Tse-tung and maybe even Lenin would have been found friends of the United States had not Washington rebuffed them. The theory is now being put to the test in Nicaragua.

To a worried segment of U.S. officials, including some in senior positions, this is madness. They believe the United States should have braved the propaganda barrage from the left at home and abroad, held its nose and supported the unsavory Somoza. Nicaragua is gone, but there will be further demands for tough-mindedness in Washington as the Central American dominoes slowly fall.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 7, 1979]  
NICARAGUA UNMOVED BY U.S. OVERTURES  
(By Charles A. Krause)

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA, August 6.—Despite U.S. efforts to cultivate Nicaragua's new revolutionary government, the guerrilla-backed administration has continued to de-

nounce "Yankee imperialism" as the root of all Third World evil and to display strong anti-U.S. sentiment.

Recent statements by leaders of the civilian junta, the Sandinista National Liberation Front and the government press reflect the antagonism toward Washington that has developed during more than 40 years of authoritarian rule by the U.S.-supported Somoza family.

While the United States maintains it is attempting to start the new relationship off on a different footing, Nicaragua's new leaders have found it difficult, or at least inexpedient, to accept any change publicly.

Barricada, the Sandinista newspaper that is currently the only one published here, has shown an increasing tendency to portray the success of the Nicaraguan revolution as a defeat for "U.S. imperialism."

In a recent commentary on the revolution's impact on the world and especially Latin America, the paper referred to the Organization of American States as the "Department of State's Ministry of Colonies." It noted that there have been "important changes" in Central America "in which those who resist imperialist aggression have not been exterminated."

The only foreign news printed in Barricada is based on Prensa Latina, the Cuban wire service that freely interchanges references to the United States with synonyms such as "the imperialists" or "the reactionary forces."

At a press conference Saturday night, junta member Alfonso Robelo appeared to blame the Carter administration for a shortfall in international food aid to Nicaragua, despite the fact that the United States has provided more emergency relief than any other nation.

[The State Department, responding to the charges of insufficient American assistance, said today that 150 tons of food a day will be made available to Nicaragua over the next few weeks.

[A statement said 1,000 tons of food will arrive by sea in Nicaragua on Wednesday as part of a substantial aid increase planned for this week. It said future aid levels will be much higher than over the past few weeks, when sea arrivals were not possible and some planes had mechanical difficulties.

[Last month the department said that U.S. emergency relief for Nicaragua between June 15 and July 25 totaled \$2.97 million.]

Robelo charged that Washington had not lived up to its promises to provide substantial quantities of emergency food and said, "I cannot help but think this is due to political considerations."

When told by reporters that, according to the Nicaraguan Red Cross, the United States has provided Nicaragua with more food and medicine than any other country in the world, Robelo said he was not aware of the Red Cross figures.

Barricada, which has promptly reported shipments of food and medical teams from Cuba, Mexico, Chile, West Germany and other countries, waited a week before mentioning that U.S. Ambassador Lawrence Pezullo had returned to Nicaragua with a plane-load of emergency supplies sent as a gift from President Carter.

In an interview last week, Lea Guido de Lopez, the revolutionary government's minister of social welfare, failed to mention the United States among the donors of emergency aid. When reminded of Carter's symbolic plane-load, which included a large shipment of needed cooking oil, she replied: "Oh, yes. But we have nothing to cook in the oil."

Although the new government has largely tried to calm U.S. fears that it would actively support other revolutions in Central America, Interior Minister and Sandinista leader Tomas Borge said last week that the junta "probably would not" stop volunteer Nica-

raguans from fighting with guerrilla groups active in Guatemala and El Salvador.

Borge added, however, that Nicaragua wanted good relations with its Central American neighbors. His comments came the night before he welcomed Sen. Edward Zorinsky (D-Neb.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who arrived over the weekend for a short factfinding trip.

The feeling of distrust expressed by Nicaraguan officials toward the United States appears to be mutual in the case of some officials in Washington.

A Western diplomat arriving in Managua over the weekend after discussions with State Department officials quoted one of them as saying that "we're just waiting for the Sandinistas to lift their masks."

U.S. diplomats here are known to be concerned about the anti-American statements by government officials and the press. If the criticism of U.S. aid efforts continues, one official said over the weekend, "they're going to put us out of business."

So far, U.S. emergency assistance is continuing at ever higher levels. Chartered planes fly in every day from the United States. Land convoys are arriving from neighboring Costa Rica and Honduras, and a ship loaded with 1,000 tons of food and medicine sent by Washington is scheduled to arrive Tuesday.

Still, the attacks continue, sometimes apparently based on a conscious or unconscious lack of understanding.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington, D.C., July 31, 1979.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am writing to invite you to a press conference to be held at 11:30 a.m., Wednesday, August 1st, in Room 2168-A, Rayburn House Office Building, at which time former members of the Nicaraguan National Guard will present statements alleging atrocities by the F.S.L.N., the Sandinista Liberation Front.

Since the surrender of the Nicaraguan National Guard it would appear that the Marxist-led Sandinistas have embarked on a program to systematically execute thousands of members of the Nicaraguan National Guard. This is being done despite promises by the United States to the Guard leadership that they would not be in harms way. In addition to apparent planned executions, allegations of widespread acts of wanton brutality and violence will also be detailed.

Appearing at the press conference will be seven high ranking officers of the National Guard including "Commandant Bravo" who has been in Washington for the past week (despite press reports that he is in Miami raising an army to invade Nicaragua).

The seven officers and their former positions are:

Rank, branch, name, and code name  
Colonel, Infantry, Alberto Smith, Bravo Charlie.

Major, Infantry, Pablo Emilio Salazar, Bravo (Commandant).

Captain, Infantry, Justiniano Perez, India 2.

Captain, Infantry, Roger Gomez, Mercenario.

Captain, Infantry, Juan Wong, Johnny Walker.

Lieutenant, Air Force, Noel A. Ortiz, Desconocido.

Sergeant, Infantry, Roland Torres, 92.

Accompanying the Guardia officers will be wives and other relatives of Guardia officers and one non-Guardia civilian who was married to a member of the Liberal party. These individuals will have sworn affidavits attesting to atrocities they have witnessed during the days of the Nicaraguan War and subsequent to the Sandinista takeover. (Samples of these affidavits are attached to this letter.)

The above group is accompanied by Mr.

William Flo Rito, who flew hundreds of these people out of Nicaragua at the request of President Somoza. The Nicaraguan president feared for the lives of the Guard and their families.

The point of affording these people an opportunity to speak to the American press is to provide them a forum to call upon the American government to conduct an immediate investigation of these war crimes. If this so-called people's revolution is typical of past communist takeovers, then we do not want another Katyn Forest, Cuba, Cambodia or South Vietnam.

I urge you to attend and participate in this meeting.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. MURPHY,  
Member of Congress.

Attached herewith are the sworn statements of 19 individuals who attest to the fact that genocide was being carried out on a massive scale when they fled Nicaragua after the Sandinistas established their government.

#### DECLARATION OF SGT. ROLANDO TORRES, SERIAL NO. 20648

This is my third time in the United States.

On June 13th, while I was doing undercover work in civilian clothes on Barrio "La Fuente," I saw a person being pulled by a car. People were saying it was 2d Lt. Gutierrez, from the police force, but recognized it was actually Lieutenant Gutierrez's son, from the Police Third Company. He was captured at the Barrio Urbina, dragged all over the area and later on assassinated.

Knowing all this and other cases, like the ones in El Dorado, where the main command of the Sandinistas was, there were more than 25 executions that I know of. There is the case of the Poeta Carpiñero, the two police students, one of them four months pregnant. They opened her belly and pulled the fetus out. This was done by the group of Commander Clifford Scott, a basketball player from the UCA, while he was drunk and celebrating. I, after knowing all this, decided to take my family out of Nicaragua on a blue plane that was flying daily out of Managua. I took my family to the airport on July 17th, with the intention of staying myself in Nicaragua. When I was at the airport I saw everybody leaving, and decided to put my family on the first plane out, and in a moment of excitement, I jumped in the plane to Guatemala.

On a telephone conversation with Managua, I learned that Lt. Gutierrez, whom I had seen at the Military Hospital as he was wounded, was taken out of the hospital and assassinated.

I heard over Radio Sandino of this new assassination on July 26th, but I know in the United States the people do not know these things. So I tell the people at home to stop this. I am sorry for my English, and hope you understand.

#### DECLARATION OF MRS. FRANCISCA MORALES DE TORRES, WIFE OF LIEUTENANT ORLANDO TORRES OROZCO AND MOTHER OF 4 CHILDREN, AGE 14, 12, 10 AND 5

I lived in a Military Residence, and I did not have peace as every day we were threatened by members of the F.S.L.N. One night we decided to escape and look for refuge in a Red Cross camp, abandoning all of our belongings, leaving my mother, one brother and a nephew as prisoners of the F.S.L.N., as all the families of members of the Armed Forces had to do. My sister and her son is married with Sergeant Benito Bravo and up to this date have no news from them. I fear because as an example I have the case of my husband's friends, Lieutenant Bermudez, who was assassinated with all his



family and we saw that the sandinistas were inexorable and their threats of death were true, and when they sentence someone, they do it, without respect of women, children and old men. When we saw this, we decided to escape and it is for this reason we find ourselves here, and request refuge for our family.

I would like to mention the specific case of Lieutenant Juan Ocon, who was made prisoner by the F.S.L.N., tortured, shot and still alive cut his head off, we went to his wake, and we saw that as the family could not find his head a plaster head was buried with him. These are cases which I believe the Human Rights should know and investigate, and we believe these cases should be known to them, and not only the cases which the F.S.L.N. presents. On leaving Nicaragua, we have left behind our country, our families, and because we feel our lives threatened we look for refuge and help from the United States.

JULY 29, 1979.

DECLARATION OF MRS. JANET ARGUELLO DE AGUILAR

I am 30 years old, married. My husband is Captain Hugo Aguilar (F.A.) and I became involved in the war, as my husband is a pilot. A square of the F.S.L.N. of around 100 men came to my house. The square was called Panama and was formed of foreigners. This people entered my home and I was persecuted, and for this reason I had to hide in a neighbors house, staying for 15 hours under a bed. The sandinistas were looking for me to execute my son and me. Our home was burned with all my belongings, including my car, cloth, etc. Afterward I had to look refuge in a house of friends at the militaries residence, where they also came with terror and death. This can be proven in the Central American newspapers, where a specific case is shown in a photograph where Lieutenant Tomas Felipe Briones Barreto is assassinated, this was shown in a Guatemalan newspaper. During the time we were as refugees and hidden from the F.S.L.N. they did not cease in their search to assassinate us, and for this reason we were forced to immigrate to this country through the Red Cross. We hope the United States will bring us help as our children have suffered hunger and a painful war, as Nicaragua suffered an international war. I escaped and find myself here after 14 years of work and sacrifice, because my husband was not only an Air Force Pilot, but also a crop duster and a farmer. I worked hard, and now our family is in the street, waiting for help and protection, which we hope to find in the government of the United States. I was also forced to come as a refugee and to request protection to the Red Cross, as I have 3 minors, and in Radio Sandino and Radio Reloj from Costa Rica announced we were wanted in Managua to be executed. This was heard by me and by other friends that visited us in the places where we were refugees and asked us to leave the country or we would be assassinated.

DECLARATION OF CAPTAIN (INF.)  
ROGER GOMEZ SANDINO

On September 1978 I was stationed temporarily in the city of Masaya, when this city was attacked by members of the F.S.L.N.

About 6 kms. from the Command we had a detachment of around 20 men and Major (INF.) Domingo Gutierrez as a Commander in charge. This detachment was attacked by the F.S.L.N. that same night. When the situation was normal, after 4 days of combat, I was sent by the Commander of Masaya to investigate the whereabouts of Major Gutierrez and his soldiers. After several inquiries, an old lady called me and told me that Major Gutierrez and six soldiers were buried behind Magdalena church, so I went to that place and started digging, and found

seven corpses completely burnt and beyond recognition. We were told by witnesses that they were captured and were thrown into the hole alive, sprayed with gasoline and burnt.

In other places we found five more corpses of enlisted, who were also burnt.

On June 1979, while I was stationed on the South Zone, under Commander Bravo, and while in the company of Captain Wilfredo Gutierrez, we heard through the radio and television that the father and brother of Captain Gutierrez was executed.

On July 14, while I was as a Commander of an infantry troop at the South Zone fighting against members of the F.S.L.N. set out from Costa Rica, I captured a Panamanian who was wounded in a leg. After giving him medical attention and giving him food I questioned him, and he told me he was recruited in a city in Panama where there was an office recruiting Panamanians who wanted to go fight in Nicaragua. They were promised 500 U.S. dollars a month, a house in Nicaragua when the war was over, and 10,000 U.S. dollars in case of death, which would be sent to their families. According to him, payment was never received by any of them. He also informed me that the Boss of the Panamanians was Hugo Espadafora, who was in Sapoia, Nicaragua; also, he said that 600 Panamanians were fighting in Nicaragua, 50 women from Cuba, and that all artillery (mortars 120, 81, 82 and rifles S/R 75mm) were commanded by Cubans.

I sent the prisoner to the Command on July 15 on a helicopter. On July 18 I retreated with my troops as we were out of ammunition, reaching the highway on July 19th, at 07:30 a.m.

With three more officials I headed to San Juan del Sur (Port), to look for trucks to transfer the troop, but when arriving at the port, I was captured with the other 3 officers by the F.S.L.N., who wanted to execute us, but the townspeople and the priest asked them to keep us alive. Then the priest took us to the church, where we were left as prisoners, and the F.S.L.N. took our arms away. Around 1:00 p.m. I was set free as our troops had the city surrounded so I could go to where our troops were to tell them to surrender, or otherwise we would be executed. I went with the priest to talk to my troops, leaving the other three officers as hostages. I told the priest we did not want to fight with the F.S.L.N. troops, as we were superior in number and innocent people would die, so an agreement was made (a pact) as he checked that what I told him was true. The pact was that we would enter in San Juan del Sur to take over the lighters (rafts) to travel to San Salvador and that neither one of the troops would start shooting. We all did this, leaving towards San Salvador and leaving the city to the Sandinistas. After 26 hours or navigation the lighter where I was ran out of diesel, so we decided to anchor, staying there all night and part of the next day.

In the lighter we had women and children, so I decided to swim ashore, to look for water, food and diesel. I reached the coast at 6:00 p.m., improvising a raft and next day at 5:00 a.m. headed to the lighter, carrying only water. I could not take the water to the lighter because an airplane with the F.S.L.N. initials was flying over and the sharks were lurking. Lieutenant Roman and myself decided to try again to reach the coast, which we did at 4:00 p.m. Then we headed to a place called La Punta del Rosario, where we found a lady, who was going to Manguera, El Salvador, on a small boat. She took us to that place, where we learned that all the people of the lighter had been rescued, with the exception of twelve soldiers who surrendered to the F.S.L.N. when they were threatened by two nurses

who came to the lighter in a small boat to give them water, that if they did not do it, they would sink the lighter. The twelve soldiers were taken to the port of Potosi. The small boat came back to pick up more people, which was boarded by some officers, women and children. On the way, the officers forced with arms to change course and to head towards El Salvador, instead of Potosi. Once in El Salvador, the officers sent two boats to rescue the rest of the troop, which was done before the lighter was sunk by an airplane commander by the F.S.L.N.

Afterwards, when inquiring on the whereabouts of the twelve soldiers, I was told they were executed in Potosi by the F.S.L.N.

July 23, 1979. After arriving in San Salvador and meeting with Bravo, he told me that the Panamanian soldier that I had sent to his Command was let free with a sign that read: We are not assassins GN.

The sandinistas, afterwards, broadcasted on their radio station that this panamanian prisoner had escaped by chance, because they left him surrounded by booby traps, which was not true.

Afterwards, over a telephone call with Managua, I learned that Captain Wilfredo Gutierrez had been executed in Managua on July 26, 1979.

DECLARATION OF FRANK ESPINO SALGADO

My name is Frank Espino Salgado, son of Lieutenant Eduardo Espino, who is prisoner in Managua, with my mother Teresa de Espino. As far as I know they are prisoners in what the sandinistas called Prisoners Camp, at the Zona Franca Industrial, near Las Mercedes Airport. I am 18 years old.

My case is the following: On January 31, 1979, my father and I were ambushed by the sandinistas, and escaped, saving our lives. We were attacked with firearms. I was badly wounded on my right lung, losing also two fingers of my right hand. I was in the hospital one month and one week.

The sandinistas pillaged our home, and all I have left is the cloth I have on.

I had to leave my home, and wherever I go the sandinistas look for me, as they want to kill me. I know of sons of other members of the Armed Forces to whom the sandinistas have captured and have killed. Such is the case of the Marin family, who lived at the Colonia Zagalb and all the family was killed.

Mr. Alvaro Sanchez was taken out of his home, was shot in front of his home in the presence of his children and his mother. For the above mentioned, I know that if I come back to Nicaragua I will be assassinated, and it is for this reason that I request asylum in this country as I thank God I could be evacuated by the Red Cross.

JULY 29, 1979.

DECLARATION OF MARIA ANTONIETA GUIDO

I am a civil, just like my husband, we owned two radio stations Radio Linder and La Voz de la Victoria, however, both were members of the Liberal Party, and like such, transmitted the news in the national broadcasting, of the Liberal Party. When the sandinistas took over Santa Rosa, they knocked at the door, hitting also with their firearms, screaming: Come out, come out, that we are going to execute you. My husband and I answered that we were sick and that could not come out and they replied that if we did not open they would force the door open. We knew that if we opened the door we would be killed, so we escaped through the back door. Our only fault was to be members of the Liberal Party, as we cannot even say we were sympathizers of Somoza, my husband was just a Liberal that loved his party.

When we escaped through the back door, we left with our sons under fire of weapons. We left to look for refuge at the Red Cross. We have been condemned to death, and they

call us "sapos". We know of the case of Pedro Pablo Espinoza (Poeta Carpintero) who was a newspaper man and a writer, who was captured at El Dorado, tortured, pulling his eyes out when he was still alive, killing afterwards.

It is for all the things explained above, that we wish to find refuge in this country, as we know their threats are not a joke.

**DECLARATION OF MRS. ISABEL LOPEZ DE CHAMORRO, WIFE OF LT. MANUEL HERNANDEZ**

I am mother of five children, ages 14, 13, 12, 11 y 8 anos. We lived at Colonia 5 de Diciembre in Managua, Nicaragua. I was forced to escape looking for a safe place to Monsenor Lezcano, at my mother's house, when the sandinistas took over where we lived. The sandinistas were searching for us to execute us, and also for other families whose members were militaries at the Guardia Nacional. Afterwards, they came look for us at my mother's house, where we were forced to escape again, to Los Altos de Masaya. From there I tried to come back to Managua with my family, and on the way my oldest son was captured and tried to force him to fight with them, but I intervened, telling them he was a minor and then they decided to let him go free taking prisoner my nephew who was 19 years old. They also wanted to force him to fight against the Guardia Nacional, and when he told them he was not doing so, was executed immediately in front of our home, burning his body with gasoline. During all this time I had no news from my husband, who was at the Bunker. Finally, we decided to find refuge at the Red Cross, as that was like a human hunt. My father, mother and my son 19 years old still in Nicaragua.

**DECLARATION OF JORGE ALBERTO PINEDA**

Name: Jorge Alberto Pineda.

Age: 25 years.

Married, name of his wife: Luisa Garcia Rodriguez.

On June 6 the sandinistas occupied Leon. They attacked Aeropuerto Godoy until completely overtook the city.

Since then to this date the city of Leon is under absolute control of a communist socialism, where they operate as follows:

(1) Rationing and expenditure of food and medicine upon presentation of identification cards, extended only to allies of the system.

(2) Expropriation of all private property.

(3) Total exclusion of persons whom they call bourgeois, who do not receive food or medical assistance.

(4) Restriction of movement within the city: Confiscation of vehicles belonging to the civil population. Permission needed to be able to go from one part of the city to the other, and to leave the city.

(5) Installation of Commanders on each block and parts of the city.

(6) Obligatory military service to all young men, who receive military training and arms. Summary executions to militaries and their families. Specifically the public execution of 13 soldiers who had surrendered at the Stadium in Leon.

(7) Up to this date, Leon is under this type of operation and refuses to follow directions of the new constituted government in Managua.

July 29, 1979.

**DECLARATION OF GUILLERMO MIRANDA**

My name is Guillermo Miranda, auxiliary member of the Guardia Nacional, on service at the Escuela de Entrenamiento Basico de Infanteria (EEBI).

I want to mention the case of Pedro Pablo Espinoza, better known as Poeta Carpintero, reporter, member of the Liberal party in

Nicaragua, and anti-communist, who was made prisoner during the last days of the month of June, 1979, when the sandinistas took El Dorado and Don Bosco. He was prisoner for 4 days and was judged several times, on one occasion they granted permission to his son to visit him, and the son asked the sandinista to be exchanged by his father, as his father was over 50 years old. At the end, after being prisoner in the most inhumane conditions he was shot in the Park of El Dorado, and was buried with other 20 persons at the Park.

The same day that Pedro Pablo Espinoza was assassinated, Sergeant Edwin R. Ordonez, of service at the Escuela de Entrenamiento Basico de Infanteria (EEBI), was burned alive in the same Park of Residencial El Dorado.

My name has been mentioned in Channel 4 Television, WQBA La Cubanissima as wanted by the sandinistas, this was on Wednesday July 19, 1979. I know I am sentenced to death, as all of the ones that have been members of the Armed Forces of Nicaragua, including all members of the family. It is for the above mentioned that I request asylum in this country, which I entered on a Red Cross flight that took food and medicine to my country.

July 29, 1979.

**DECLARATION OF GIOCONDA ARGUELLA (DIVORCED), DAUGHTER OF MAJOR JAIME ARGUELLO**

My father is a prisoner in Nicaragua. I am with my mother, Adela de Arguello, my sister Jackeline Arguello and my daughter Gioconda Espinoza Arguello.

Because my father was a military we were constantly threatened to death; a contact bomb was thrown into our home, causing only material losses. Afterwards, we were called over the telephone and were told that if we did not leave our home, we would not see the sun next day. We feel we cannot come back to Nicaragua, as our neighbors, the Marin family, who lived next to us and had in their family members of the Guardia Nacional, were assassinated, so we decided to find refuge at the Red Cross.

Our watch man, told us that he witnessed this assassination. For all these reasons above mentioned, we request refuge, as we feel our lives threatened in Nicaragua.

**DECLARATION DE LA SRA. GLADYS DE RUIZ**

My name is Gladys de Ruiz, I am a widow of Captain Miguel Angel Ruiz. I lived in Monsenor Lezcano in Managua, Nicaragua, and mother of four children, one of them, Cesar Augusto Ruiz, is a Lieutenant of the Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua and is 29 years old.

My children names are: Miguel Angel Ruiz, 30 years; Vidal Ernesto Ruiz, 22; Gloria Lucila Ruiz, 26; and Lieutenant Cesar Augusto Ruiz, 29 years.

Since the sandinista movement started in Nicaragua we have felt threatened not only my children and I, but also the rest of the family.

Our family and I have been persecuted and had to leave our homes, to find a safer place; they go from place to place asking neighbors if they know where we are, and the ones that have been found, they kill, and look not only for the Lieutenant, but also for my other three children, that have no relation whatsoever with the Guardia Nacional, only the fact that their father and brother are connected with the Guardia Nacional.

On June 8th, 1979, the sandinistas attacked 3rd Police Station, which was located next to our home, killing all military; they were forced out of Police Station with bombs, and the ones that were captured alive were taken to the streets and shot in front of the civil population. The sandinistas put

fire to our house with gasoline, and the only thing left of all our belongings was the clothes we had on. We have to hide wherever we go, and wherever we go the sandinistas ask neighbors if they know where we are, with the intentions of killing us.

I also know of the case of Lieutenant Rene Silva, from Matagalpa, who was in the battle front, the sandinistas went to his house and killed his wife and two children, 4 and 2 years old.

I also know the case of the General Director of Customs, Dr. Rafael Saavedra, who left his house to find a safest place at Don Bosco, where the sandinistas found him, killing his two sons, and burning him alive. This occurred during the first week of July, 1979. For the reasons above mentioned, I was forced to evacuate in a Red Cross airplane, and request asylum in this country, as I am certain that if I come back to Nicaragua, my sons and I will be killed.

July 29, 1979.

**DECLARATION OF MRS. MARIA ANTONIETA BUSTOS**

I am the wife of Major Alejandro Bustos (Inf.), we have seven children, that are with us, ages 18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13, 10.

I left my country because I was persecuted with my children only because I am the wife of a member of the Guardia Nacional. I could not leave my children, or they would have been captured or forced to enroll into the F.S.L.N. During our last days of our stay in Nicaragua an armed group of the F.S.L.N. came to our home at Colonia Independencia, and threatened all families of officers of the Guardia Nacional to leave our homes within the next 24 hours, and to leave all of our belongings. We were threatened with firearms in our chest, so I decided to abandon our home to find refuge at the Red Cross, where we were evacuated.

I beg the government and authorities of this country of the United States, to grant us refuge, to give us a chance to live again, to start a new life.

**STATEMENT OF LT. COL. ALBERT SMITH**

During my last two years of military service in the Nicaraguan National Guard, I served as military observer to the Organization of American States. I was in Honduras for a period of thirteen months. After this assignment I was assigned as Commander of a combat battalion based in Managua. In this position all my missions consisted of fighting Sandinista guerrillas throughout the country. Most of the time the battalion was assigned to missions in the countryside. It has been my experience that wherever we went there was always information and stories from the people as well as from civil authorities of the atrocities and inhuman acts committed by the Sandinistas. Many times I had the sad task to be a witness to the criminal results of their actions. With these types of experiences I lived intensively during the last eight months of the war.

During the final weeks of the conflict I had the function as quasi operations officer for the Army. I knew the general situation throughout the country and had constant communication with the different commands. I came to the conclusion that we needed a great deal of outside support in order to continue fighting and to contain or bring the war to an end. Meanwhile there were political conversations being carried on at another level, between the U.S. Ambassador Pezzullo and other higher authorities: we were ignored in helping in the resolutions that were being formulated there.

During the final days, the U.S. Military Attache, Colonel James McCoy, requested to have private conversations with me and



I agreed to such talks. In the course of our conversation the first question he asked me was in regard to my personal opinion of what would happen in the event of a sudden departure of our President and all of our higher ranking officers. I told him that as a career officer I belonged in the army and that such political maneuvers were not my concern, since, based on our constitution, the army functioned as a separate body; but, I made it clear that a continued struggle between the Sandinistas and the Guard needed urgent support in order for the Guard to obtain a military victory. To this he replied that it was his feeling that it was very possible that once Somoza was out, the countries that had given active support to the Sandinistas, such as Panama, Costa Rica, Venezuela, and the other South American Nations members of the Andine Pact, would immediately stop military support to the guerrillas and try to work out a peaceful settlement and would provide for a provisional coalition government.

Nevertheless, the main reason for his private conversations with me was based on the fact that he was fearful that the army, with the departure of Somoza, would lose its unity and effectiveness; it looked to me that he wanted it both ways. I made it clear that given the proper support from the democratic countries of the world, (the U.S. at the head), the Nicaraguan army would maintain its unity since we were a professional institution of the nation and not a private army.

The armed struggle in Nicaragua continued even after the departure of President Somoza. More than 24 hours went by without receiving any indications of aid or intervention from anybody for the National Guard. There was no change in the attitudes of the other nations in regards to their ceasing help to the Sandinistas.

At this time the casualty rate of our troops was increasing due to the lack of support from our artillery (for lack of ammunition) and our Air Force who was not able to support their part because of the lack of ordinance and fuel. I decided to call Colonel McCoy and ask him what was happening with reference to our past conversations and what the terms of the agreement were that led to the departure of President Somoza. His answer to this question was that there was nothing that could be done any more and that for any further information I should call Ambassador Pezzullo, giving me his telephone number. It seemed strange to me to call the Ambassador. However, I called the Ambassador and asked the same question. He replied that the newly delegated President Urguio and the newly appointed army staff were wasting their time by asking him to come up with impossible solutions. Instead, they should accept the direct proposals that were being asked by the Sandinistas which demanded the immediate surrender and dissolution of the Nicaraguan army. I explained to the Ambassador that it was ridiculous to accept such conditions from the Sandinistas when no guarantees and assurances existed for the personal integrity and safety of our troops. Also, it meant the end of a loyal institution that had existed for fifty years, serving with pride and respect, and that as such, it was inconceivable to end it at the request of the Sandinistas.

His simple and tragic answer was, "He was very sorry about it."

I only hope that Ambassador Pezzullo and Colonel James McCoy are forced by this Congress to escort an international investigative group to identify the slaughtered bodies of our once proud Guard, who were not given a fighting chance to live. Then let them say to the world, "We are sorry about it."

#### RÉSUMÉ

Name: Alberto Smith Delgado.

Born: Bluefields, Nicaragua, November 10, 1936.

Studies: Graduated from the Nicaraguan Military Academy, class of 1955-59.

1959, Jungle Warfare: Fort Sherman, Canal Zone.

1965, Basic Airborne: Fort Sherman, Canal Zone.

1965, Jump Master: Fort Sherman, Canal Zone.

1960, Basic Infantry: Fort Benning, Georgia.

1967, Advanced Infantry: Fort Benning, Georgia.

1967, Ranger: Fort Benning, Georgia.

1976, Pathfinder: Fort Benning, Georgia.

1977, Command and General Staff College (Class of '77), Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

DECLARATION OF AUXILIADORA AND ESPERANZA SILVA, SISTERS OF LT. RENE SILVA, AGE 17 AND 15

We were forced to leave Matagalpa city, as we witnessed the assassination of the family of a military. We left Matagalpa afoot to Managua, where we went to look for refuge at the Red Cross. The family's name was Buitrago, and a member of their family was member of the Guardia Nacional. It is for this reason and because we are also family of another member of the Guardia Nacional, that we feel our lives threatened in our own country, that we were forced to leave and look for refuge in this country.

JULY 29, 1979.

DECLARATION OF MRS. AMELIA VDA. DE FLORES (Wife of Captain Victor Flores, who died in combat)

I was constantly threatened over the telephone that we were going to be killed, lately the sandinistas gave us 48 hours to leave our home, only because my husband was a military. My oldest son, age 16, was also wanted by the F.S.L.N., to be executed, and I was forced to escape with my five children with only what we had on, without shoes and money. We looked for refuge at the Red Cross, where afterwards were evacuated to this country.

I need help, and request help to the government of the United States, as a widow I am in helplessness with 5 minor children that need to go to school.

JULY 29, 1979.

DECLARATION OF MRS. NORA ALTAMIRANO

I am the wife of Cnel Altamirano (Sub-Director of Immigration), I am here with four of our sons, of 21, 19, 18 and 2 years of age. In Managua still are my two oldest daughters, 22 and 20 years old.

The sandinistas came to my home, destroying everything we owned. They also went to a small farm we had, where the house was burned. When we found ourselves without food and clothing, we look for refuge at the Red Cross, from where we were brought to this country, where we would like to find refuge, as we feel our lives are threatened. My two daughters are in Nicaragua, one in Masaya, and the other one in Chinandega.

JULY 29, 1979.

DECLARATION OF CAPTAIN JUSTINIANO PEREZ

I am a 1967 graduate of the Nicaraguan Military Academy. There were leftist movements by that time already in my country, and they were totally supported (training, weapons, economics), by the Cuban Regime. Our officers and NCO's underwent training programs at the Canal Zone (School of the Americas and IAAPA), most of them oriented to the neutralization and control of guerrilla movements and, quoting reports of the School of the Americas, the U.S. Army had trained a total of 4500 officers and troops of the Nicaraguan Army by the summer of 1977. In the same way, personnel were trained at

Ft. Benning, Georgia, and Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, and several other bases and training camps around the United States.

In the last years of the 60's and in the beginning of the 70's, the National Guard counted over 80 percent of our trained officers and NCO's were trained by officers and NCO's of the U.S. Armed Forces. In May 1977 I was promoted to the rank of Captain, and in July 1977 named executive officer of the Basic Infantry School, which assigned mission was to train recruits for the National Guard.

A short time later the United States cut all military aid to Nicaragua stating that we were Human Right violators. After this happening, the leftist guerrilla movement augmented their activities and started to move into the cities. The international propaganda was well directed by the communists, in a way that they changed the National Guard image to the eyes of the world, to the point where the Sandinista atrocities were considered freedom acts, and the National Guard actions, violations to the Human Rights. Without the U.S. military aid, our school took over the responsibility of training all the National Guard personnel and the terrorists began an elimination campaign against our personnel. The students were eliminated while on leave. Our intelligence service captured complete Sandinista lists of the entire personnel of the school, detailing address, number of relatives and even the political affiliation of everyone of the members of the family, and information so complete that it included elimination date.

During the final stage of the war, the training was suspended and all the students sent to front duties in the different sectors of the country. Most of them were sent to the South front, where the National Guard were confronting international brigades, mainly of Cubans, Panamanians, Venezuelans, Costa Ricans, and Columbians, who were departing from sanctuaries located in Costa Rica attacking the different defensive positions of the National Guard in the Nicaraguan territory.

In Managua the fight was house to house, until we recovered the city. At the end, our hospital was full of wounded personnel and we were short of combatants. We had only 200 men.

July 16th, 1979. There was a general staff restructure and I was appointed CO of the Basic Infantry School and that same day we had a meeting with the President. We were introduced to the new general staff and to the President designate. The President said also, that he had to leave office and the country as a pre-condition to obtain aid from the United States.

At that moment our troops were running out of ammunition and gasoline. What happened after that, everybody knows . . . The military aid from the U.S. never got there; the President designate fled to Guatemala. The new Chief of Staff began negotiations with the F.S.L.N. about the rendition terms, and trying to save the lives of the National Guard men. But everything fell when the Sandinistas stated that the only thing left was unconditional surrender.

While they were negotiating, the guerrilla columns were approaching Managua, and the Chief of Staff ordered the Field Commanders to look out for themselves and to save the lives of their troops. The first thing I did was to send all the wounded personnel to the Military Hospital, which already was under Red Cross attendance and was declared a safe area by Sandinistas. I found later on that most of these personnel have been killed at the hands of the Sandinistas.

July 19th, 1979. In the morning I led the rest of my troops to the International Airport, where we awaited an aircraft that never arrived. At or about 11:00 a.m. the Sandinistas started to arrive at the area, so I

ordered my troops to change clothes (to civilians), and to disperse from the spot and to head to secure places. Some went South, and I never heard of them again; others went East, and found refuge at La Zona Franca, which was under Red Cross attendance, and I now know at this moment all were transferred to the Carcel Modelo (jail), under F.S.L.N. domains not the Red Cross. Right before I left the Airport I saw a summary execution of two soldiers who were saying to the Sandinistas to respect human rights. I had the chance to see some captives who were guided to an unknown destination. I made it all the way to the Guatemalan Embassy, and there I found out the guardsmen at the Zona Franca were being executed by the Sandinistas. Everybody people were arriving at the Embassy, crying for help because their relatives had been killed at the hands of the Sandinistas. I managed to get out of both the Embassy and the country, but the butchery has continued by the guerrilla and no one has said anything regarding the human rights of guardsmen and their families.

As a conclusion I state:

The Nicaraguan National Guard was an organized Army, trained solely by the U.S., and left to the hands of the Sandinistas by the United States.

The Nicaraguan National Guard was accused of violations of Human Rights in a vicious false way, while Sandinistas killed and executed civilians and nobody says a word about it.

The Nicaraguan National Guard has not been defeated as an Institution or in the battle field, but are victims of an international conspiracy and all are marked for extermination.

I firmly believe that the Nicaraguan case is the second warning to the free world about what the communism is, and you must consider the rest of the Central American nations (El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala) in serious danger, and so the whole American continent.

It is indeed unfortunate that most of my countrymen do not speak English nor you Spanish but I hope for the sake of humanity you have understood what has been said today.

#### CURRICULUM

Name: Justiniano Perez Salas.  
Age: 33.  
Rank: Captain.  
School: NMA Graduate, Class '67.  
Officer Basic Course, School of the Americas 1966.  
Counter guerrilla operations, School of the Americas 1967.  
Officer Basic Course, Ft. Benning, Ga. 1969.  
Paratrooper School, Ft. Benning, Ga., 1969.  
Ranger School, Ft. Benning, Ga., 1969.  
Special Forces School, Ft. Bragg, N.C. 1970.  
Advance Infantry School, Ft. Benning, Ga. 1971-72.

#### DECLARATION OF MAJ. PABLO E. SALAZAR

This statement pursues a sole objective, to let the world know through the U.S. Congress, what the real truth is concerning the case of Nicaragua.

Right after the triumph of the Cuban Revolution that paved the way to power for Fidel Castro, this character began to export revolutions around the world, especially to Africa and Latin America, as everybody knows.

His main objective was the control of territory and exercise of political power over the Central American nations. The primary threat to gaining this objective was Nicaragua, due to personal aversion to the Nicaraguan and well known anti-communist leader Gral. Anastasio Somoza D., and his well known friendship with the "Imperialistic U.S."

After reaching power, and for the next 18 years, the communist regime of Cuba, indoctrinated, trained, supplied (materially and economically), and has led, revolutionaries for the F.S.L.N. which since its birth and to this very moment has iron bound ties with the ultra-left wing of communism (marxist-leninist). Through two decades, the Castro Dictatorship, has been technically backing up, supporting combat actions and supplying sophisticated weapons, to leftist movements fighting the constitutional governments of the Central American area. And in our case the regional communist wing in Nicaragua. Guerrillas were neutralized, due to the governments that were legally constituted and of democratic origin.

When Mr. Jimmy Carter was elected President of the U.S., and instituted his policy of "respect of Human Rights"—the sandinistas quickly moved their fight to reach power—masquerading themselves as freedom fighters for human rights—the Cuban regime along with the international socialists, and the leftist movements of the continent along with the complicity of the governments of Carlos Andres Perez from Venezuela, Rodrigo Carazo, from Costa Rica, and Omar Torrijos from Panama, supported the so-called revolutionary war that has given pass to so much bloodshed and destruction in Nicaragua, physically, economically and spiritually. These three governments were friends of the Somoza government for years, but due to the covert intervention of Cuba in these countries, they were induced to, support first, organize later, and in the end train and supply troops and weapons to the international brigades of communist affiliation, while at the same time permitted their territories and facilities to be used by these brigades as training camps, supply routes and sanctuaries. For the first time in the contemporary history of America as a Continent, there were no valid international treaties or respect of international law, not even the bilateral treaties between Nicaragua and Costa Rica stood.

Initially, the governments of Cuba, Venezuela, Panama and Costa Rica, and later supported by the countries of the Andean pact were part of the mediation commission that promoted and sent a very dangerous precedent in the American history as a continent. At this moment no member of the OAS can feel secure from open communist aggression, when their allies act on behalf of international communism, embracing the promulgated principles of the communist manifest of Carlos Marx, which seeks a rise to power over the entire world by using the method of total destruction of the existing establishment to gain its goal.

In the last decade the Occidental world has lost to the communism, Indochina, most of Africa, and in the past two years the first continental nation of America—for the first time in history communism has a continental base (Nicaragua), not an isolated island (Cuba). Nicaragua is a base of strategic importance due to its natural position, the very center of America. The communists have effectively split North and South America, and in less than a day can separate the Atlantic from the Pacific by taking Panama, all without saying all the facilities can now be used as training camps and sanctuaries to launch revolutions to the North and South, first to El Salvador, Honduras and even the democratic Costa Rica, (later will be Guatemala), all of which have open leftist movements seeking forward the actual overthrow of their respective governments. To a degree greater than Nicaragua two years ago, all this in the disguise of Human Rights. The consolidation of Central America, the allegiance of the parties in power in Mexico and Venezuela, will give to international communism a definite influ-

ence and access to the rich oil fields of the continent. If you do not take action to neutralize this error in policy immediately, you will be fighting a war in your own territory in no more than five years.

What has changed in Nicaragua?

After forty years you said that the Somoza government was corrupted, that it did not respect human rights, that there were hundreds of missing persons, that there was a black list and all would go with Somoza. I ask why at this moment do you allow in Nicaragua:

Real black lists.

Real concentration camps.

Abolishment of the commission for Human Rights.

Abolishment of the right to free expression.

Abolishment of the right to circulate freely.

At this moment there is a butchery, persecution of Guardsmen, summary executions of Guardsmen as well as their relatives and families, of pro-Somoza particulars, all of them loyal to Constitutional government to the bitter end, and what about the promises of the revolutionaries? Where is your standard of Human Rights that you measured us by?

A number of people have escaped to freedom, now we have trouble to reestablish ourselves in work and to resume normal lives, we want the chance to live and work, and to integrate ourselves into your American Society, for we are Americans already. Most, if not all of us were trained directly or indirectly by the U.S. Armed Forces, our noble military friends have not turned their backs to us, we defended our government with the same high ideals of duty, honor, country, taught by our American trainers, all of us here today feel betrayed, not by our American comrades, but by Jimmy Carter policy.

We are not asking for compassion, but an opportunity to help you understand that destruction of our democracy is on the hands of the Siberian bear dressed in colorful Latin clothes.

#### CURRICULUM

Name: Pablo Emilio Salazar Palz.  
Age: 37.  
Primary School and High School: Colegio Salesiano, Granada, Nicaragua.  
Military Courses: Graduated from the Nicaraguan Military Academy as Infantry Officer, 1959-1963.  
Counter Guerrilla Course, Fort Gulick, Canal Zone, 1964.  
Airborne Basic Course, Fort Gulick, Canal Zone, 1965.  
Jump Master, Fort Gulick, Canal Zone, 1965.  
Ranger, Fort Benning, Georgia, 1966.  
Application School of Warfare, Turin, Italy, 1967-1970.  
Infantry and Cavalry School, Cezano, Rome, Italy, 1967-1970.  
Infantry Officer Advance Course, Fort Benning, Ga., 1972.  
Designated Commander of Operations South Zone, Battalion plus Reinforce Commander, 1979.

#### STATEMENT MADE BY CAPT. JUAN WONG, JR.

"Only fools do not learn from the errors and trials of the past." And it is the responsibility of statesmen and leaders of the world to inform themselves and assess the current events that influence our lives and the future.

My statement does not pretend to shed upon this honorable body new enlightenments or revelations; it is only aimed to relate actual facts and modus operandi to which I was a witness in Nicaragua during the past fourteen years.



The political downfall and total devastation of the established systems and foundations of what was once "a peaceful and prosperous" nation did not come about as a violent result of armed revolution by a small group of "patriotic muchachos" (as the U.S. press has labeled them). On the other hand, these modern and sinister Robin Hoods were only part of a well orchestrated international conspiracy that evolved through the persistent work and fanatical political efforts of a small group of international communist revolutionaries.

Gentlemen, in synthesis I am referring to an intelligent conspiracy planned and directed from outside our frontiers, tried and proven in the past and one that is accelerating in process today in other nations of our hemisphere, now that Nicaragua is lost. I am talking about a well oiled machine that is undermining and making a mockery of human rights and destroying the democratic foundations of our world.

The strategy and tactical evolution that I witnessed can be divided into the following steps:

(1) The Creation of a hard core group of individuals with definite goals and international revolutionary ideals in mind. This was carried out in 1961 in Nicaragua when the original Frente Sandinista was created by Carlos Fonseca Amador, German Pomares, Tomas Borge, and others. Borge is now the Minister of the Interior of the new government of Nicaragua.

(2) A religious, spiritual and moral brainwashing of the middle and upper middle class that masquerades as a social awakening to institutionalized injustices? In Nicaragua this was carried about by communists and radical infiltrated religious groups and individuals such as Father Sanguinez, Parrales, Quintanilla, Cardenal and other self-acknowledged Marxist socialists, who established social Catholic movements with the purpose of installing in the people a guilty feeling and prepare the school age children with a frame of mind of social revolution.

(3) All throughout this period of time they maintained a continual terrorist armed struggle against the established authorities, led by fanatical hard core international revolutionaries and adventure seeking youth, transformed into picturesque guerrilleros while alive and/or martyrs of the revolution when killed in combat. This policy was well carried out in Nicaragua.

(4) The dramatization of staged actions and events to attract the attention and support of the international community and its press; which provides sensational headlines and stories that "entertain" readers and viewers rather than inform them.

(5) With their goals achieved and a military victory obtained, now comes the systematic annihilation of all the surviving individuals that were directly or remotely connected to the previous system now destroyed. We have come here today to appeal to this honored body and to the conscience of the free world that it represents. All my fellow officers that will appear before you today have been trained in the United States of America and we all embrace and uphold the ideals of the American fighting man, so respected throughout the world. We shall present to you today, documented statements that have been made numerous times over the past years all of which are well known by all of the intelligence services of the U.S.A. but were never revealed to this body.

Our comrades in arms, our families and friends that remain behind in Nicaragua are presently in stage five of the revolutionary process, and as such they are being liquidated today . . . at this very moment. Gentlemen, if this is not stopped by the powers of the free world; tomorrow it will be El Salva-

dor, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico . . . and before you realize it, "patriotic muchachos" will be crossing the Rio Grande.

#### RÉSUMÉ

Name: Juan Wong, Jr.  
Born: Leon, Nicaragua, November 3, 1943.  
Studies: Grammar School: Instituto Pedagógico (Nicaraguan school run by Christian Brothers (LaSalle)—1950-55); Jr. high school and high school: St. Mary's College High School, Berkeley, California (run by Christian Brothers (LaSalle)—1956-61.); College: University of San Francisco, California. Major in marketing and industrial relations (run by Jesuits—1961-65); Advanced courses in business administration from INCAE (Central American Institute for Advanced Business Administration—run by Harvard University in Nicaragua).

Work: Business Administrator in Managua; Assistant to Major General Jose R. Somoza; Entered the Nicaraguan National Guard as a Lieutenant in May 27, 1974. Promoted to Captain on May 27, 1979.

#### STATEMENT OF LT. COL. ALBERT SMITH

During my last two years of military service in the Nicaraguan National Guard, I served as military observer to the Organization of American States. I was in Honduras for a period of thirteen months. After this assignment I was assigned as Commander of a combat battalion based in Managua. In this position all my missions consisted of fighting Sandinista guerrillas throughout the country. Most of the time the battalion was assigned to missions in the countryside. It has been my experience that wherever we went there was always information and stories from the people as well as from civil authorities of the atrocities and inhuman acts committed by the Sandinistas. Many times I had the sad task to be a witness to the criminal results of their actions. With these types of experiences I lived intensively during the last eight months of the war.

During the final weeks of the conflict I had the functions as quasi operations officer for the Army. I knew the general situation throughout the country and had constant communication with "the different commands." I came to the conclusion that we needed a great deal of outside support in order to continue fighting and to contain or bring the war to an end. Meanwhile there were political conversations being carried on at another level, between the U.S. Ambassador Pezzullo and other higher authorities: we were ignored in helping in the resolutions that were being formulated there. During the final days, the U.S. Military Attache, Colonel James McCoy, requested to have private conversations with me and I agreed to such talks. In the course of our conversation the first question he asked me was in regard to my personal opinion of what would happen in the event of a sudden departure of our President and all of our higher ranking officers. I told him that as a career officer I belonged in the army and that such political maneuvers were not my concern, since, based on our constitution, the army functioned as a separate body; but, I made it clear that a continued struggle between the Sandinistas and the Guard needed urgent support in order for the Guard to obtain a military victory. To this he replied that it was his feeling that it was very possible that once Somoza was out, the countries that had given active support to the Sandinistas, such as Panama, Costa Rica, Venezuela, and the other South American Nations members of the Andine Pact, would immediately stop military support to the guerrillas and to try to work out a peaceful settlement and would provide for a provisional coalition government.

Nevertheless, the main reason for his private conversations with me was based on the fact that he was fearful that the army, with

the departure of Somoza, would lose its unity and effectiveness; it looked to me that he wanted it both ways. I made it clear that given the proper support from the democratic countries of the world, (the U.S. at the head), the Nicaraguan army would maintain its unity since we were a professional institution of the nation and not a private army.

The armed struggle in Nicaragua continued even after the departure of President Somoza. More than 24 hours went by without receiving any indications of aid or intervention from anybody for the National Guard. There was no change in the attitudes of the other nations in regards to their ceasing help to the Sandinistas.

At this time the casualty rate of our troops was increasing due to the lack of support from our artillery (for lack of ammunition) and our Air Force who was not able to support their part because of the lack of ordnance and fuel. I decided to call Colonel McCoy and ask him what was happening with reference to our past conversations and what the terms of the agreement were that led to the departure of President Somoza. His answer to this question was that there was nothing that could be done any more and that for any further information I should call Ambassador Pezzullo, giving me his telephone number. It seemed strange to me to call the Ambassador. However, I called the Ambassador and asked the same question. He replied that the newly delegated President Urguio and the newly appointed army staff were wasting their time by asking him to come up with impossible solutions. Instead, they should accept the direct proposals that were being asked by the Sandinistas which demanded the immediate surrender and dissolution of the Nicaraguan army. I explained to the Ambassador that it was ridiculous to accept such conditions from the Sandinistas when no guarantees and assurances existed for the personal integrity and safety of our troops. Also, it meant the end of a loyal institution that had existed for fifty years, serving with pride and respect, and that as such, it was inconceivable to end it at the request of the Sandinistas.

His simple and tragic answer was, 'He was very sorry about it'.

I only hope that Ambassador Pezzullo and Colonel James McCoy are forced by this Congress to escort an international investigative group to identify the slaughtered bodies of our once proud Guard, who were not given a fighting chance to live. Then let them say to the world, 'We are sorry about it'.

#### RÉSUMÉ

Name: Alberto Smith Delgado.  
Born: Bluefields, Nicaragua—November 10, 1936.  
Studies: Graduated from the Nicaraguan Military Academy, class of 1955-59.  
1959—Jungle Warfare: Fort Sherman, Canal Zone.  
1965—Basic Airborne: Fort Sherman, Canal Zone.  
1965—Jump Master: Fort Sherman, Canal Zone.  
1960—Basic Infantry: Fort Benning, Georgia.  
1967—Advanced Infantry: Fort Benning, Georgia.  
1967—Ranger: Fort Benning, Georgia.  
1976—Pathfinder: Fort Benning, Georgia.  
1977—Command and General Staff College (Class of '77), Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

Some Members who attended a press conference I held on August 1, 1979, may recall that Pablo Emilio Salazar popularly known as Commandante Bravo sat by my side to warn the U.S. Government that we were supporting a regime that was conducting systematic "re-

venge murders" not only in Nicaragua but through hit teams sent to other Central American countries. The U.S. Government through the voice of the State Department scoffed at these charges when they were made in August. I would remind Members that Comandante Bravo is the same officer whose murder I have just described.

I would also remind Members today that Salazar's death can be laid directly at the doorstep of America's misdirected Latin American policies. I would repeat to members Major Salazar's words of warning of August 1 when he said:

Most, if not all of us, were trained directly or indirectly by the U.S. Armed Forces. Our noble military friends have now turned their backs on us. We defended our government with the same high ideals of duty, honor, and country taught by our American trainers. All of us here today feel betrayed, not by our American comrades, but by Jimmy Carter's policy.

Salazar concluded his August 1 testimony:

We are not asking for compassion, but an opportunity to help you understand that destruction of our democracy is in the hands of the Siberian Bear dressed in colorful Latin clothes.

I would remind Members that it was the U.S. policy to insist on free elections in 1979.

The urgency was so great this Government could not wait for the promised supervised elections in 1981—just 16 months away.

The urgency for free elections was so great that this Government could be construed as assisting in the destruction of 40,000 human beings in Nicaragua. Free elections being the theoretical basis for the revolution.

We must all wonder what happened to that sense of urgency that existed in the State Department and the administration in mid-1979 that cost the lives of so many people.

I urge Members of this body to assure the same sense of urgency and insist on the free elections which would be guaranteed by this amendment.

□ 1350

We know who is running Nicaragua today. I place in the Record with this colloquy the background, the training, and of course the motivation of those persons. I also include the remarks of the Anti-Communist World League of the Nicaraguans in Exile expressing the sentiments on conditions existing in Nicaragua today.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I hope that the committee will sustain this amendment.

**NATIONAL DIRECTORATE OF FSLN BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON THE SANDINISTA GOVERNMENT LEADERS**

**TOMAS BORGE MARTINEZ, 50 YEARS OF AGE**  
Trained in Cuba.

Last surviving founding member of the Sandinista movement (FSLN).

Co-leader of the Marxist Prolonged Popular War faction of the Sandinistas.

Minister of Interior in the new Sandinista government. Key position giving him control over the police and internal security.

Adjutant Chief of the Popular Sandinista Army.

Self-confessed murderer. Convicted in February 1977 to 30 years for shooting to death 2nd. Lt. Rodolfo Sequeira Connolly on February 4, 1976. At his trial Borge stated that "from a legal standpoint there was no justification for this shooting."

Borge also admitted to joint responsibility for the murders of Narciso Zepeda, Gustavo Andino and other fellow-terrorists in the FSLN and "executed" in the Chinandega area on orders of the regional heads of the FSLN.

In his trial testimony Borge stated he had spent several months in Cuba in 1960 receiving military training at the hands of the Cuban army, together with a number of fellow FSLN terrorists.

He gave details of the FSLN involvement in a series of terrorist campaigns between 1960 and 1976 to subvert the constitutional authority in Nicaragua.

In 1964, the FSLN attempted for a short time to work within the existing political system in coalition with the Nicaraguan Socialist Party. A schism developed and the FSLN decided to return to armed opposition.

Following defeat with heavy losses at the hands of the Nicaraguan National Guard on January 22, 1967 at Pancasan, Borge returned to Cuba with more than 15 fellow terrorists for additional military training.

From Cuba, the group dispersed returning to Central America via Czechoslovakia and other eastern bloc countries. Borge with Henry Ruiz suffered a series of arrests between 1969 and 1971 in Costa Rica and Colombia.

In Colombia, the Communist Party provided Borge and Henry Ruiz with passports and funds received from Mexico "which had been provided by Havana."

In 1974, Borge assisted in the planning of the assault on the private home of Dr. J. M. Castillo Quant, killed together with a servant and a guard.

On February 4, 1976, on being confronted by a military patrol, he shot and killed 2nd. Lt. Rodolfo Sequeira Connolly as the officer approached him for questioning. He made his escape, but on running into a second military patrol, he discarded his gun, threw up his hands and cried out, "I am Tomas Borge, don't shoot me." He was arrested alive, convicted and imprisoned on February 25, 1977.

At his trial Borge said "while we were in Cuba, Comandante Ché Guevara offered to help us."

Asked by the court if the Sandinistas had received training in Cuba, Borge said yes.

During his court testimony, Borge revealed that the Sandinistas had received support and were in communication with other terrorist organizations including the FAR (Guatemala), Tupamaros (Uruguay), Montoneros (Argentina) and the Al-Fatah.

Borge admitted to numerous "acts of economic recovery" i.e. bank hold-ups, kidnappings etc. Between 1961 and 1975, at least 29 robberies of banks and businesses were carried out by the Sandinistas.

The Sandinistas carried out over 61 summary executions of "jueces de mesta" (peasant leader given certain official authority in civil matters.)

*Tomas Borge Martinez, founding member of the FSLN and self-confessed murderer and terrorist*

On being captured, Borge declared himself to be a revolutionary without any fixed address. He admitted to having been involved in subversive activities for 14 years and his testimony in open court provided the most comprehensive insight that there had been into the FSLN organization and operations.

1. Borge was convicted to 30 years for shooting to death 2nd. Lt. Rodolfo Sequeira Connolly on February 4, 1976, as the officer approached him for questioning. At his trial

Borge stated that "from a legal standpoint there was no justification for this shooting."

2. Borge also admitted to joint responsibility for the murders of Narciso Zepeda, Gustavo Andino and other fellow-terrorists in the FSLN, "executed" in the Chinandega area on orders of the regional heads of the FSLN.

3. In his testimony, Borge stated he had spent several months in Cuba in 1960 receiving military training at the hands of the Cuban army, together with a number of fellow FSLN terrorists.

4. He gave details of the FSLN involvement in a series of terrorist campaigns between 1960 and 1976 to subvert the constitutional authority in Nicaragua.

5. In 1964, the FSLN attempted, for a short time, to work within the existing political system in coalition with the Nicaraguan Socialist Party. A schism developed and the FSLN decided to return to armed opposition.

6. Following defeat with heavy losses at the hands of the Nicaraguan Guardia Nacional on January 22, 1967 at Pancasan, Borge returned to Cuba with more than 15 fellow terrorists for additional military training.

7. Between 1969 and 1971, he and a companion suffered a series of arrests in Costa Rica and Colombia and sought and received the help of Communists and the party in these and other countries (e.g. Peru) in Latin America.

8. In Colombia, the Communist Party provided him and his companion with passports and funds received from Mexico "which had been provided by Havana."

9. In 1974, Borge assisted in the planning of the assault on the private home of Dr. J. M. Castillo Quant. He did not take part in the actual assault and remained in hiding in Nicaragua after the action.

10. On February 4, 1976, on being confronted by a military patrol, he shot and killed 2nd. Lt. Rodolfo Sequeira Connolly as the officer approached him for questioning. He made his escape, but on running into a second military patrol, he discarded his gun, threw up his hands and cried out, "I am Tomas Borge, don't shoot me." He was arrested and is alive and well in a Nicaraguan prison, following his conviction on February 25, 1977.

11. At his trial Borge said "while we were in Cuba, Cmdte. Ernesto Guevara (Che) offered to help us in Nicaragua. Twice I spoke to him and each time he said he would like to participate."

12. Asked by the Court who had financed the stay of the Nicaraguans in Cuba, Borge said "We received the hospitality of the people and government of Cuba." Asked if the hospitality included training, Borge replied "Yes".

13. During his court testimony, Borge revealed sources of support and communications with other terrorists and political organizations in Latin America. Said Borge "we had contact with all the well-known groups including FAR (Guatemala), Tupamaros (Uruguay) and the Montoneros (Argentina)."

14. Questioned on the types of arms on which members of the FSLN had trained, Borge mentioned the Garand semi-automatic, Browning machine gun, M-3 Thompson sub-machine gun, Rising\*, Siuser\*, Maining\*, Alfal (Belgium), Alka (Soviet Union), bazooka (American), 60 mm mortar, 120 mm mortar (Czech), light and heavy 30 caliber machine guns. Following clashes with the Nicaraguan Guardia Nacional, substantial numbers of weapons and materiel were found.

15. To finance their operations Borge

\* It is assumed that he meant Reising, Hispano-Suiza and Miniman.



stated they engaged in what he called "acts of economic recovery". He spoke of the hold-up of the Banco de America in Managua. According to Nicaraguan government sources, between 1961 and 1975, at least 29 robberies of banks and businesses, kidnappings (including one American citizen) and attempted extortions were carried out by the terrorists.

16. The FSLN, after failing to win the support of the peasantry, stormed and pillaged villages in their attempt to retaliate against those villagers who they suspected of reporting their whereabouts and activities to the authorities.

17. The FSLN carried out over 61 summary executions of "Jueces de Mesta" (usually peasants assigned to act as the "local" authority in a village or given area). As a member of the top Council of the FSLN, Borge acknowledged these acts and deaths as "acts of war" and "summary executions" and accepted "collective" responsibility for them.

Feb. 1977: Tomás Borge is sentenced to 30 years in prison by a Nicaraguan military court, the maximum sentence permitted under law.

Aug. 24, 1978: Tomás Borge is released from prison as part of the negotiated demands of the FSLN following the assault on the National Palace in Managua. Together with 58 fellow Sandinista terrorists, Borge is flown to safe haven in Panama.

Sept. 26, 1978: EFE reports the arrival in Havana, Cuba of Tomás Borge. He is received by representative of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in Cuba.

Sept. 27, 1978: Fidel Castro receives Tomás Borge who briefs the Cuban leader on operations in Nicaragua.

July 15, 1979: Washington Post reports that Tomás Borge is appointed Minister of Interior in the cabinet announced by the Sandinista junta in Costa Rica. As Interior Minister, Borge, last surviving founding member of the FSLN and Marxist ideologue, would control the police and internal security forces of the country.

#### FIDEL AND SANDINISTA LEADER TOMÁS BORGE MEET

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, met with Tomás Borge, founding member of the leadership body of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN).

In the fraternal meeting between the two revolutionaries, Borge briefed Fidel on the most recent events in Nicaragua and the heroic resistance put up by the people and their vanguard, the FSLN, in the face of the atrocities committed by Somoza's National Guard. He also referred to the outlook for the struggle and drew attention to the need for greater international solidarity.

Borge also spoke of the joint effort being made by the anti-Somoza forces to overthrow the tyrannical regime and establish a democratic and popular government of national unity.

The meeting was also attended by Manuel Pifreiro, member of the Central Committee of the Party and head of the Central Committee's American Department, and Ulises Estrada, deputy chief of the department.

VICTOR TIRADO LOPEZ, 39 YEARS OF AGE

Trained in Cuba.  
Mexican national.

Joined the Mexican Communist Party in 1968.

A leader of the Tercerista faction of the Sandinistas.

Co-signed Sandinista communique published in Mexico's daily newspaper "Excelsior" (Oct. 1978) bragging of having summarily executed "dozens and dozens" of

Somoza supporters in 10 of the 16 departments of Nicaragua.

HUMBERTO ORTEGA SAAVEDRA, 30 YEARS OLD

Trained in Cuba.

Younger brother of Daniel Ortega.

Chief of the Popular Sandinista Army.

Member of the Sandinistas since 18 years of age.

Former leader of Communist student group at the National Autonomous University of Nicaragua.

Co-signed Sandinista communique published in Mexico (Oct. 1978) bragging of having summarily executed "dozens and dozens" of Somoza supporters in 10 of the 16 departments of Nicaragua (Sept. 1978).

A letter by Humberto Ortega was found on the body of Francisco Rivera, Sandinista leader killed in the fighting in the Nicaraguan north eastern town of Esteli in April 1979. Ortega writes of the Sandinista cause as being founded on "Marxist-Leninist ideology." Also the need to downplay the Sandinista Marxist objectives and to establish temporary tactical and political alliances with the bourgeoisie until the right moment to grab the real reins of power.

"Humberto took guerrilla warfare instruction in Cuba and once reportedly traveled to Prague, a haven for left-wing terrorists." (Newsweek, July 23, 1979).

HENRY RUIZ, 38 YEARS OLD

Trained in Cuba and the Soviet Union.

One of three leaders of the Marxist Prolonged Popular War (GPP) faction of the Sandinistas.

Military strategist for the Sandinista rebels. Member Executive Committee of the National Sandinista Directorate (NSD).

Member Military Committee of the National Sandinista Directorate (NSD).

BAYARDO ARCE CASTANO, 34 YEARS OLD

Trained in Cuba.

Member of the Prolonged Popular War (GPP) Faction of the Sandinistas.

Press spokesman for the Sandinistas.

Member of the Executive Committee of the National Sandinista Directorate (NSD).

Former reporter for opposition newspaper "La Prensa," Managua.

Quotes:

"We support freedom of the press, but of course the freedom of the press we support will be a freedom of the press that supports the revolution." (Washington Post, August 1, 1979)

JAIME WHELOCK ROMAN, 35 YEARS OLD

Trained in Cuba.

Member of the State Committee of the National Sandinista Directorate.

Currently Minister of Sandinista Ministry of Agrarian Reform.

Former law professor—University of Nicaragua.

Author of two books on a Marxist theme published in Mexico in 1975 and 1976.

Killed National Guard officer in 1972 and sought asylum in the Chilean Embassy.

Studied Agriculture while in exile in Chile during the presidency of Marxist Salvador Allende.

With the overthrow of Allende in Chile returned to Nicaragua clandestinely and went underground.

Quotes:

"... in the future there would be additional changes in the government attitude toward private entrepreneurs that could produce friction (New York Times, August 5, 1979).

(New York Times, August 5, 1979) "Wheelock said he planned cooperative farms of 300 to 400 acres where each farmer would owe a part of his production to the group."

CARLOS NUÑEZ

Trained in Cuba.

Chief of Staff of Marxist Proletarian Faction of the Sandinistas.

Member of the Executive Committee of the National Sandinista Directorate.

Worked with Catholic Action in the rural areas.

Twice imprisoned in Nicaragua for subversive activities.

Appeared in Cuba after he was freed.

Reappeared in Nicaragua in 1978.

LUIS CARRION CRUZ, 32 YEARS OLD

Trained in Cuba.

A leader of Marxist Proletarian Faction of the Sandinistas.

Deputy Chief of the Popular Sandinista Army.

Formerly very active in student movements.

DANIEL ORTEGA SAAVEDRA, 35 YEARS OLD

Trained in Cuba.

Member of Sandinista Junta.

Member State Committee of the National Sandinista Directorate.

Co-Signed Sandinista Communique published in Mexico (Oct. 1978) bragging of having summarily executed "dozens and dozens" of Somoza supporters in 10 of 16 Departments in Nicaragua (Sept. 1978).

Served seven years in prison for bank hold-ups and terrorism.

Released in 1974, went to Cuba.

Quotes:

(Daniel Ortega) "He detailed for the first time Nicaragua's new foreign policy, notably by offering support for liberation movements around the world." (New York Times, Sept 7, 1979).

"The Sandinistas are in favor of 'freedom of expression that does not go against the interests of the people.'" (Christian Science Monitor, August 20, 1979).

"Ortega warned that those who disagreed with the decisions made by the Junta and the Sandinistas might fall into the category of traitors." (Washington Post, August 1, 1979).

Daniel Ortega identified as a "pragmatic Marxist" by James Nelson Goodsell. (The Christian Science Monitor, July 16, 1979).

MIGUEL D'ESCOTO, FOREIGN MINISTER OF GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION

Nicaraguan. Maryknoll priest, formerly resident in New York.

Sandinista Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Active militant in church and activist causes in U.S.

As publisher of the Maryknoll Orbis Books (publishing) commissioned "Guardians of the Dynasty" by Richard Millet, a historical account of the Somoza family and Nicaraguan National Guard.

In the introduction, D'Escoto advocates "a new, non-capitalist system," which will require "relinquishing possessions and privileges." An advocate of violence as a solution to social problems and the "theory of liberation."

Came out openly for the Sandinista subversive movement in October 1977 after a failed terrorist attempt which left scores of innocent people and National Guardsmen dead in unprovoked attacks.

Engaged in anti-government political activities as a member of the so-called "Group of Twelve."

Active in Non-Intervention in Nicaragua (NIN), a political activist group in the U.S. operating with the close support of the Marxist North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA).

Chairman of the board of FUNDECI, a closed corporation set up by members of his immediate family in Leon, Nicaragua,

to administrate low-cost housing project made possible by U.S., \$7 million in private U.S. contributions.

Congressman JOHN MURPHY,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

The anti-Communist World League of the Nicaraguans in exile, deeply concerned with 75 million dollars loan to the Communist Sandinista government of Nicaragua that will be considered by the House of Representatives next week, respectfully requests the House members to vote against this loan that would strengthen and solidify a Communist regime in the Central American vital strategic area and would encourage the monstrous systematic violations of human rights by the Sandinista Government only parallel to that of Cuba.

1. The undeniable Communist dominated structure of the Sandinista Government is evidenced by the following points:

(A) 3 members of the 5 member of Junta are Communists.

(B) The 9 main senior commanders that form the security and military backbone of the Sandinista army are Communists.

(C) The 45 junior commanders who form the second line of military command of the Sandinista army are Communists.

2. The undeniable character of semi-colony of the Soviet empire of Nicaragua as the second so called "free land of America" (Cuba was the first one) and whose policies both in the internal as well as in the international sphere are dictated from Moscow via Havana:

(A) Through a huge Cuban embassy disproportionately large for a country the size of Nicaragua.

(B) The presence of 3 thousand Cuban troops disguised as teachers, so called "doctors" (they work only on the para-medic level) and technicians in different areas. (It is a well known fact that all Cubans over 17 fall under compulsory military service). All these Cuban soldiers in disguise or without it constitute the real military strength of the Sandinista Communist government.

(C) The security Sandinista secret police is fully directed and really commanded by Cuban officers and so called Cuban and Chilean Communist advisers.

(D) The immigration office is now directed and totally supervised by Cuban security officers.

(E) The Communist style police-state established in Nicaragua, is only second to that of Cuba, with a security and spy net organized in the cities by small sections and block by block control and systematic denunciation of the activities and movements of each citizen.

(F) The virtual control of all the ministries and government offices through the presence of Cuban and Chilean communist "advisers" who really dictate the government policy towards the "communization" of the country.

(G) The client state character of the Nicaraguan government towards the Soviet Union's foreign policy as evidenced (1) in the alignment of Nicaragua to the communist bloc in the general statements of foreign policy; (2) in the pro-communist votes cast by Nicaragua in international organizations and international conferences; (3) the pro-communist stand taken by Nicaragua in opposing the vote against the resolution condemning the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan; (4) the insolent and anti-diplomatic insults in official notes and public statements of the Nicaraguan Foreign Ministry and other public officials against the government of the United States; (5) the open opposition of the Sandinista Government against the American boycott of the Olympic games in Moscow through the organization of pro-Olympic Committee in sup-

port of the Moscow Olympic games presided by a member of the National Government Sandinista Junta.

3. The systematic violation of human rights by the communists Sandinista government is only second to that of the communist government of Cuba. The volume of human rights violations in Nicaragua through massive private executions and outright assassinations of anti-communists, the collective imprisonment of thousands of citizens, the refined system of communist tortures carried out by foreign communist security advisors, make the situation of Nicaragua the most degrading political scandal at the international level.

The Department of State has already reported officially that at least 400 anti-communists have been summarily executed by the Sandinista communists and more than 8,000 anti-communists are imprisoned for political reasons in Nicaragua.

People are being subjected to ad-hoc trials under application of ex-post facto laws in the largest negation of the systematic violation of all legal existing principles.

In view of this tragic situation for Nicaragua and the western hemisphere we respectfully request the House of Representatives of the United States to vote against and reject the loan of 75 million dollars for the communist Sandinista government of Nicaragua. This money would be used to enslave the Nicaraguan people even more and to spread communist domination in the rest of Central America. In a well-known university of the State of New York, Communist Sandinista Commander Jorge Wheelock, Minister of the Agrarian reform made the most graphic statement about the use of the 75 million dollars by the Sandinista government. He said: "We are going to use the capitalist money of the American imperialists to finance communist revolution."

To grant this 75 million dollars to the Communist Sandinista government would constitute a contradictory mini-political detente in the vital strategic area of Central America and the Caribbean.

If this unfortunate mini-political detente were engineered with dangerous unforeseeable consequences and the subsequent blackmail of 75 million dollars to be paid by the American taxpayers to the Sandinista government, if the House of Representatives approves this loan, it should do so only with the express condition that all the 8000 political prisoners should be released from the Sandinista jails and a general amnesty should be required to be decreed by the Sandinista government in order to grant diplomatic safe-conduct to the hundreds of citizens who are asyled in different Latin American Embassies for more than 8 months. The safe conducts have been delayed by the Sandinista government in open violation of Inter-American International law.

Very respectfully,

ULISES FONSECA TALAVERA,  
President of the Anti-Communist  
World League of Nicaraguans in  
Exile.

CRISTOBAL MENDOZA, Secretary.  
SANDRA TABLADA,  
Womens' Representative.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) has expired.

(At the request of Mr. LAGOMARSINO and by unanimous consent, Mr. MURPHY of New York was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When a number of us visited Nicaragua at Thanksgiving recess time, we asked the members of the national directorate of the Sandinista front what their plans were with regard to elections. They gave two rather interesting replies. One was that they saw no need for an election because they would obviously win.

The other response was something along this line, that we have to reeducate the population before they can vote.

I would like to ask the gentleman in the well, is it not true in our request of the Somoza regime for free elections that we had no such condition of any kind of reeducation?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. The gentleman is correct. If I could expand on the question, there already has been one election held in one municipality in Nicaragua. Perhaps this was a test election. Maybe it is familiar to some of the Members who study elections in Communist countries.

There was one candidate. There was one candidate. And it was a question of voting "yes" or "no."

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. If the gentleman will yield further, I understand that it was not only a question of one candidate and whether the people would vote "yes" or "no," but I understand the candidate stood before the population, and they were asked, "Do you support this candidate or not?"

Mr. MURPHY of New York. We have seen a similar type of election in Iran in the very recent past where there were two different colored ballots. You went into that voting place and you voted with a colored ballot. You did not vote "yes" or "no." That vote was almost unanimous because you know what would have happened and I know what would have happened had the wrong color gone in that box by the voter. That is the type of election we can look forward to in Nicaragua if the United States does not exercise a degree of control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. HARKIN and by unanimous consent, Mr. MURPHY of New York was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Certainly it is no secret to Members of this House of the gentleman from New York's long support of the Anastasio Somoza government in Nicaragua, and certainly it comes as no surprise to this Member that the gentleman in the well is proposing this type of amendment.

I just wonder if we might not want to perfect the gentleman's amendment a little bit by adding a new paragraph D under section 2, which would read as follows: Paragraph D: Anastasio Somoza wins.



Mr. MURPHY of New York. In response to that question, I point out that President Somoza is not in Nicaragua. He is in permanent exile. He is not in the United States either. I think the gentleman is trying to be facetious. In any event I would not accept the amendment because I do not think it would be germane to the bill or to the amendment in question.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZABLOCKI AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF NEW YORK

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZABLOCKI as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MURPHY of New York:

Page 5, line 8, strike out the closing quotation marks and the second period; and immediately after line 8 insert the following:

"(k) The President shall encourage the holding of free, open elections in Nicaragua within a reasonable period of time and shall, in providing any additional assistance to Nicaragua, take into consideration the progress which is being made toward holding such elections."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is a member in this committee who does not desire that there be free democratic elections in Nicaragua under the conditions spelled out in the amendment of the gentleman from New York. Yet, I submit, we cannot require such conditions by legislation. I cannot think of more than 10 countries throughout the world where we give assistance, friendly countries at that, that could meet these conditions.

We do want a freely elected democratic Government in Nicaragua. Therefore I have offered my substitute stating that the President shall encourage the holding of free and open elections in Nicaragua within a reasonable time—within a reasonable time.

Mr. Chairman, while the Sandinistas had promised early elections, one problem they have run into is the absence of a system of voter registration. With the mass destruction and disruption that has taken place, it is likely that they will have to undertake a nationwide census before reliable voter records can be created. Making assistance contingent on holding elections is unprecedented. We have placed that requirement on no other aid recipient. So why should we do it for Nicaragua now?

The gentleman from New York stated that such a requirement was made of the prior Nicaraguan Government. In 40 years of supporting Somoza, we never required him to hold elections, although in the last year we did urge him to do so. But we did not require him to do so by legislation as a condition for assistance.

Now the gentleman from New York would set a deadline for a new government to move into elections even though they cannot yet meet the requirements of registration. There is a need for a census. What type of election do you want in a hurry?

It is also the gentleman from Wisconsin's understanding that if the Sandinistas type of election or even a free election had been held shortly after the takeover, after the revolution, they would have won. The Sandinistas would have won.

What we are trying to do here is to build support, in the private sector, in the religious community, and elsewhere, for the people to be able to select a government of their own.

I agree that we should be using our influence to move the government in that direction, but we should not make that mandatory by U.S. legislation.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am happy that my colleague has yielded, and he knows there is no Member of this body who I hold in higher esteem.

Would he tell me what he considers a reasonable period of time?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Well, it is really a judgment and anyone can select a particular day. The gentleman selected December 31, 1981, but I would submit that if there were to be a census, it would take a couple of years to organize an election.

The gentleman knows that the process of a nationwide Presidential election in this country takes more than a year. We have conventions. We have selection of delegates.

It is impossible to set a particular date. The gentleman from Wisconsin is in no position to select a date, even though the gentleman from New York has suggested his own date. It may or may not be a valid judgment. I would submit that a reasonable time could be 6 months, it could be 1 year, or it could be 3 years—we just do not know.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. In response to my colleague, I might say this: A reasonable time for elections as we see throughout all of the parliamentary democracies of this world that when a parliamentary government does not receive a vote of confidence, there is a reasonable period of time to permit the government to place the issue before its people. Elections are conducted normally within 90 days.

□ 1400

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) has expired.

(At the request of Mr. MURPHY of New York, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ZABLOCKI was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that reasonable period of time is usually 3 to 5 months. That takes place in country after country.

Now, we go back to the specific case in point. The reason why 1981 or for al-

most 2½ years since the Sandinistas took power is not a long enough period of time for this regime in Nicaragua to have elections, and I will precede my reasons with this statement:

Elections in Nicaragua took place for the last 40 years according to a constitution and according to the date specified in those constitutions.

I attended two of those elections, observed the election process, the voting and the ballot counting. The gentleman from Illinois from the other side and the gentleman from Texas on this side went to Nicaragua with me while we reviewed that election process. The problem with that election process was that it was patterned after U.S. elections.

Now, the imposition the United States wanted on the Somoza regime was to move their elections up in time, a condition that had been agreed to. They also wanted the question on the ballot to be, should the President go or stay? That was going to be the simple ballot process.

We are not asking for those restrictions. We are not asking for the restriction of no registration. All we are asking for in this amendment is to have the voting places at the traditional voting places where all the Nicaraguans have been voting for the last 40 years in the towns and in the cities at what they call the mesas, the voting tables.

We do not even ask for international supervision of the elections. We presume that the United States will be looking, that the Organization of American States that intruded in this process and made recommendations will be observing. We do not even call for that. All we say is 2 years and if 2 years is not a reasonable period of time, I do not know what is; but I think I know the reason why the gentleman is trying to get away from this question of free elections. There will not be free elections in Nicaragua on the part of the Sandinistas. There will not be free elections under this Sandinista government because they cannot win a free election.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to point out that what the gentleman from New York wants to do with his amendment is to write into U.S. legislation what is to be done in another country.

To say what is a reasonable time is a matter of judgment; but we all know from actual fact that in other countries in Latin America where the revolutions have been less extreme, they have had to take a lot more time than 2 or 2½ years in order to get around to either a constitutional process or a free election process. And these were countries not ravaged like this one.

What we need to do is to support the concept which has been proposed in the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin and eliminate the mandatory features of the

amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his observations and contributions.

I must point out, too, that in established countries where it would take less time to hold an election than would be required to hold an election in Nicaragua, the devastation has not been subjected to the same destruction as has happened in Nicaragua. There are problems, but I am hopeful that we will have an election in Nicaragua, a free election within a reasonable time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

I would suggest that the Sandinistas send some observers to Rhodesia, which also is a country that has been devastated and has run one election and will run another one very shortly; but more than that, the gentleman's party has always been innovative in finding ways to register people. We can recall the program offered here for instant registration where people could walk up and register and vote.

Then there is postcard registration. I am sure that the gentleman could come up with some way to register these people to vote which is certainly better than no elections at all.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution; but I would like to say, I have heard that there are some communities in the United States that are even more adept than the Federal Government in registering voters.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have a question for my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. RUDD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ZABLOCKI was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the election process under the constitution which even the Sandinistas, even they have not repudiated yet, indicated that the elections will be held on March 1, 1981, and that the government elected will be seated on May 1, 1981.

It seems to me these processes are already in order. I only ask why the gentleman thinks they cannot be complied with, when we know that this is something that has been going on for 40 years.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

If this amendment prevails, it would encourage the present Government in

Nicaragua to postpone the election until November or December of 1981.

There are indications, as the gentleman from New York has admitted and others have stated, that the present Government has committed itself to a date for national election; the Government has promised to hold national elections. Some local elections have already been held. The convocation of the Council of States to perform legislative functions and draft new electoral procedures was postponed from the original date of September, 1979, and is now scheduled for May 1980.

There is evidence to suggest that free elections will be held in Nicaragua within a reasonable time. If not we can take another look at the situation next year.

I hope my substitute amendment will prevail.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to support the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) and to oppose the amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY).

I do so for several reasons; No. 1, I think the amendment being offered by my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) is worded in such a way as to cause the exact problem that we now find ourselves in Latin America today; that is, telling our Latin American friends how to run their government, when to have their elections, where to have their elections, how much TV time shall be devoted by one party or another party, who shall have access to that TV time.

I think this goes just a little too far. It is just a little bit too specific. I think this amendment creates the type of problems that we have gotten ourselves into in Latin America over the years because of our, if you will, imperialistic or adventurist policies. Not only in terms of the economy, but in terms of our own ideology and imposing that ideology on our neighbors to the south.

I would also like to point out to the Members of this body that there are, indeed, other parties, other than the Sandinistas, in Nicaragua. There is the Conservative Party, and a good friend of mine who is down in Nicaragua told me he talked with Adolfo Calero, director of the Conservative Democratic Party and was told that there was absolutely no restrictions on their organizing government activities in Nicaragua. They hold rallies. They publish manifestos. They have a regular radio show and have put up signs around Managua.

There are other parties, the Independent Liberal Party of Alphonso Robelo, the leader of the MDN, the Democratic Movement Party who spoke just recently at a rally in Ocotol in which 400 to 500 people attended. He vigorously condemned the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

There are other parties that are operating in Nicaragua. I do not want the

impression left here today and this afternoon that the political situation in Nicaragua is under complete Sandinista control. That is not the case.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield on that point?

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I will yield in just a second to my chairman.

Another point I would like to bring out is that it is true, there has been a delay in what is known as the Council of States which would be a composition of leaders from the different sectors of the society. This includes the business sector, the different political sectors, and the labor movements, who would meet in a group and draft a constitution. This drafting of the constitution is going to take time. All of us who have been involved in drafting a constitution or political document that is going to lead to the destiny of a city, a state or a nation, knows this type of activity takes time and effort. I do not think it is wise to hold those people to a specific time deadline in which they have to finish their document and then hold their national elections.

□ 1410

I talked to Sergio Ramirez, a member of the junta, when I was down in Nicaragua. He told me for sure they, indeed, will have their Council of State in May. When we consider the amount of political activity by other political organizations in Nicaragua, we consider the fact that they are going to meet and form their Council of State and put together a constitution which will guide their country. When we consider the specifics of the language of the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) in terms of directing the type of election he has suggested, I think that adds up to a situation in which we will be accused of once again interfering with the internal affairs of our southern neighbors.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I thank my colleague from Michigan for yielding.

We come to the question of what constitutes a political party, and I will confine the description to the country involved. There was one political party in Nicaragua that had representatives in all of the municipalities of the country, and that was the Liberal Party. The second most populous party was the Conservative Party. They could only have a party structure or committeemen, as we know it, in about 40 percent of the municipalities in the country. They did not hold primary elections. The Liberal Party held primary elections.

We did have a series of groups that I think the gentleman is ascribing in a very liberal tone as political parties. When the United States was trying to put together a broad opposition front to the Somoza government they brought in groups. Many of these groups were isolated to one town, many of them were people who had a mimeograph machine and about 12 followers. They also in-



cluded labor unions and certain other political groups.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(At the request of Mr. MURPHY of New York and by unanimous consent, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. A broad opposition front was supposed to be the American alternative to Somoza, and would Somoza somehow leave. Somoza said we have a constitution that says we are elected, and I will finish my term. He was ready to go to an earlier term election, and the broad opposition front could never agree among themselves as to just who would be the candidate or how things would happen, and that coalition fell apart leaving one thing. It left the Sandinistas and the Sandinistas' guns as the opposition.

In the closing days, as the people in this body know, I was present in Managua with the United States Ambassador and President Somoza and the Foreign Minister, Quintana, at a meeting that was supposed to be the transition meeting. The United States, in agreeing that Somoza would leave, had also agreed to some things. The United States agreed that they would supply the Guardia Nacional, because the Guardia Nacional was going to protect the country from a Sandinista Marxist army.

No. 2, the United States was going to replace the Somoza government with a non-Marxist junta. Somoza would leave. That was basically what would happen.

He was supposed to leave in 3 days. A week goes by, 10 days go by, and he says where is the broad opposition junta. The United States could not find it. So the United States imposed a Marxist junta, the five-man Sandinista team. I have included here the backgrounds of these gentlemen.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Let me take back my time just at that point.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. If I can just finish this one point?

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I would like to take back my time at this point and then I will let the gentleman finish, because I do not want the House to be left with the impression that the five-man junta—it is not five men, it is a woman and four men—in Nicaragua is completely Marxist. We have two Marxists and a businessman, and two other moderates in the government. We know that the Directorate, the nine-man Directorate, is controlled by the Marxists, but the five-person junta is not entirely Marxist. In fact, two of the five are Marxist and the others are not.

I will now yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. The point I have been trying to make is the question of political parties and political freedoms. We do not see the Liberal Party, the former majority party, permitted any freedom in the country other than free-

dom to walk around the prison camp. We do not see the Conservative Party permitted to move freely. We do not see La Prensa, the famous organ of Pedro Joaquin Chamorro, the martyr of this revolution, having the freedom to print what they want, except under the censorship of this government. This is the problem we are at, and that is why I am asking the committee to support my amendment and to defeat the amendment of the distinguished chairman.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, La Prensa is printing and they are printing freely in Nicaragua. Let it not be told on this floor that the paper is not printing freely.

Second, let it be also known on this floor that Adolfo Calero, head of the Conservative Party, is operating freely. I have talked to members of the chamber of commerce who belong to the Conservative Party while I was down there and they are operating with relative freedom within the country.

So, let us put these facts in some type of perspective and balance to understand there is not complete Marxist control in Nicaragua.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BAUMAN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZABLOCKI AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF NEW YORK

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAUMAN to the amendment offered by Mr. ZABLOCKI as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MURPHY of New York: Page 5, line 8, strike out everything after "K" in the substitute and insert the following:

"(1) the President shall encourage the holding of free, open elections in Nicaragua within a reasonable period of time, but not later than December 31, 1981, and shall, in providing any additional assistance to Nicaragua, take into consideration the progress which is being made toward holding such elections.

"(2) The President shall terminate assistance to the Government of Nicaragua under this chapter if he determines that a free national election has not been held in Nicaragua by December 31, 1981, under the following conditions:

"(A) The election is conducted at traditional polling and registration places.

"(B) The election is conducted without civil, military, or private interference with voting in the election.

"(C) All candidates and proponents of issues significant in the election have equal access to the broadcast media."

Page 5, line 8, strike out the closed quotation marks and second period.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland looks at this in a very realistic way. We are being asked to give \$75 million of the taxpayers' money to a government that is admittedly, if not in control of Communists, riddled with Communists at every level. There is a difference of opinion about how much control.

We are being asked to aid in the reconstruction of a country that we have been told by the proponents of this legislation could go two ways, toward totalitarian control completely, and they say it has not, or toward freedom. We have been told that it is our duty to aid these

people to gain that freedom. Now, how do you do that? Not by handing a blank check of \$75 million to a government admittedly, as the opponents say, of questionable political complexion; but by promoting, by promoting with the funds that we give them, a return to the freedom that both sides in this argument over this legislation say that they want for the people of Nicaragua.

Now, everybody apparently has talked to somebody in Nicaragua. I talked to the president of the Central Bank on February 16, Arturo Cruz, a leading moderate who formerly worked with an international lending institution here in Washington. I asked him specifically: Senor Cruz, what do you think about the restriction of a free election requirement if it is tied to this loan? And let me tell you what he said. These are from the notes taken, and he spoke perfect English.

I don't think it is a restriction. If I were a lender, I would want certain conditions. If our government wants a pluralistic government, I would think it should have free elections.

Now, that is only one voice, admittedly, one of the moderate voices in this pluralistic government that the proponents say is not dominated by Marxists.

The hard line Marxists have made it very clear that they do not want an election now. They will not permit an election now. In due time, in due time, after the people are educated, after the people are reeducated, and after the people are taught under this campaign I mentioned the other day of "Alfabetizacion," after they are taught perhaps to think in the Cuban mold.

Now, the Government of the United States under the Harkin amendment has to tell us what is the estimate of free elections and their chance. And I quote to you:

The government has not committed itself to a date for national elections, but has promised to hold municipal elections soon.

And they go on to express what the situation is.

□ 1420

That is the estimate of the Government of the United States required by law. No free elections.

All we are saying in this particular amendment is one thing, that the people of Nicaragua, if they are to spend the money that our taxpayers have to pay into the U.S. Treasury should have the same right that the people who pay those taxes have and that is to elect a representative government.

We have talked a lot in the last few days about double standards in this Chamber. You were willing to impose on Somoza, however rotten he may have been, the restrictions that he must hold a free election, even before 1981. All sorts of restrictions you wanted to impose. But when it comes to a Communist-dominated government suddenly you have been blinded and suddenly the double standard applies.

It is much easier to say that if they are pluralistic, they are not Communist-dominated. We will not require free elec-

tions of them. We require it in our country from the taxpayers who will give them this money but we will not require it of this new pluralistic government.

Yes, or yes, in El Salvador right next door you will tell them how to run their government, you will tell them they will get no aid if they do not do your bidding. But you do not dare impose such restrictions on this Sandinista government with its Cuban friends, its history of violent revolution, its destruction of human rights.

No, I think this amendment is the acid test in this legislation. If you are for helping Nicaragua, it will take more than money, it will take freedom; and the only way that can be achieved is by simply setting a date, December 31, 1981, by which time freedom will have to return in the form of free elections. And if the Sandinistas are afraid to hold those elections, it is a confession in my opinion of their inability to command national respect and national support.

Why anyone would oppose this amendment I fail to see.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I would like to get further information since the gentleman from Maryland quoted the Director of the National Bank of Nicaragua, Mr. Cruz. Did Mr. Cruz state that the free elections date should be set, a date certain, December 31, 1980, or January 1, 1981? In his remarks did he say there should be a date set for free elections, in legislation, before we give assistance?

Mr. BAUMAN. No, he did not set a specific date. I think that is within our prerogative.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I would not expect he would.

Mr. BAUMAN. I would not expect he would either.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(At the request of Mr. LAGOMARSINO and by unanimous consent Mr. BAUMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I understand Mr. Cruz resigned from that government apparently on the basis he did not feel he could move it in the direction he would like to and he is no longer a director of the National Bank?

Mr. BAUMAN. This was as of about 2 weeks ago and situations change fast.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I understand this action took place last week.

Mr. BAUMAN. It may well have been as a result of a conversation with me for all I know.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

We require free and fair elections in no other country to which we provide aid. No one single country in the world to whom we provide aid do we require free and fair elections.

In fact, only one-half of the countries receiving our economic aid, 35 out of 70, have held any kind of parliamentary election or plebiscite in the last 5 years. Out of those 35, about one-third held elections, which no reasonable observer could admit were free and open. Those were elections that had one candidate, there was only one party, they were closely supervised by the government in power. Yet we are being asked in this legislation to do something in Nicaragua which we do to no other country.

The gentleman from Maryland mentioned the country of El Salvador. I would point out that is one of the 35 countries in which no elections have been held in the last 5 years. What are the others? You can go down the list. Uruguay, Lebanon, Jamaica, Syria, Tunisia, Peru, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Paraguay, Jordan, El Salvador, Bolivia, Honduras, Liberia, Cameroon, Togo; the list goes on.

In none of those countries have we put on this kind of requirement that they have to have free and fair elections.

Of course we should encourage the Nicaraguans to hold free and open elections. I have done that myself in all dealings I have had with them and to encourage them to do it as soon as possible. But the fact they have not done it yet I do not think proves anything. Again, we have to look at what has happened in Nicaragua. They just came through a revolutionary war, a revolutionary war that left 40,000 dead, 40,000 homeless, 200,000 people injured, 40 percent of the people out of work. The country suffered a \$600 million damage to their economy during the war. A 70-percent drop in their agricultural production.

Of course they cannot have free and open elections right now.

Let me point out one other thing to the members of the committee. Let us look at our own revolution, Mr. Chairman. You know sometimes we forget as we sit here in this august body, that we are the sons and daughters of revolutionaries. We are the descendants of revolutionaries in this country. What happened in our own revolution? Did we have elections the next year? Twenty-four months after we won? No. After the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown on October 19, 1781, the first time national elections were held in this country was in 1789, 8 years later. It took us 8 years to provide for elections in our own country. Why then should we demand this other country, after they have gone through a devastating revolution—whether you agree with the revolution or not—that all of a sudden they have to, by a date certain, have free and fair elections?

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I agree we ought to do everything we can to persuade them that they should have free and open elections but, in fact, to even set that requirement as the gentleman from Wisconsin knows, is to put a requirement on

Nicaragua which we do not place on any one of the other 70 countries in the entire world to whom we give aid, whether they are countries of the right, countries of the left, or countries down the middle.

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. McDONALD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I recall during the Vietnam war we very strongly pushed the South Vietnamese Government toward free and open elections, even while the struggle was going on. In fact, as I recall, the gentleman from Iowa had some experience in this area.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, I will take back my time. All I can say is at the present time, there are 35 governments to whom we give aid who have held no elections within the past 5 years.

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. McDONALD. I think certainly in the case of Rhodesia or Zimbabwe, Rhodesia we have certainly applied the demand for elections the matter of the Byrd amendment debates, et cetera.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlemen has expired.

(At the request of Mr. McDONALD and by unanimous consent Mr. HARKIN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARKIN. We do not give aid to Rhodesia.

Mr. McDONALD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. McDONALD. Going back to the South Vietnamese experience, I recall we certainly tried, at that time, while the fighting was actually going on in South Vietnam, we very strongly demanded they have open elections. In fact I think the gentleman in the well is very knowledgeable about the tiger cages incident there in South Vietnam. It did have something to do with the climate in that country and destabilization, but I wonder if there has been any follow-up in the tiger cage situation now that there has been a change in Vietnam.

Mr. HARKIN. It has nothing to do with the elections and no I have not been back.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. The gentleman referred to no elections in the sovereign Thirteen Colonies from the time General Washington accepted the sword from Cornwallis until the first election in 1789, but is it not true we had elections in each and every one of the sovereign Thirteen Colonies? We had a Continental Congress when we sent representatives from each State.

□ 1430

Mr. HARKIN. No, no. No elections were held under the Articles of Confederation.



The members of the Confederated Congress were appointed by the States. They were not elected.

Mr. SYMMS. What about John Hanson of Maryland, who was the first President of the Continental Congress? Who was he elected by?

Mr. HARKIN. It seems to me he was appointed by the States, but he was not voted in in an open election.

Mr. SYMMS. I think it was freely elected delegates of the States, if the gentleman will reexamine history.

Mr. HARKIN. I am only telling the gentleman what the Library of Congress researched for me. In 1787 the Constitutional Convention was held in Philadelphia.

Mr. SYMMS. What I am referring to is that during that period of time that the gentleman says that there was no elected government, during that period of time—if my recollection of history is correct—what happened is that there were 13 individual colonies that had freely elected delegates.

Mr. HARKIN. Those delegates appointed members to the Continental Congress.

Mr. SYMMS. But those were elected people who made those appointments, so that we did have representative government at the earliest inception of this country.

Mr. HARKIN. Some States did.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues of the House, I have not been to Nicaragua since I am a Member of Congress. I am not the expert that many of these people who have spoken on this issue are, or probably are. But let me, as one who has traveled a bit prior to being in Congress in Central America and that area, let me give the Members my reaction about what we are doing here and why this is a mistake. Our colleague from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) pointed this out a little earlier.

There is a great sensitivity in Central America, in Latin America generally, about Yankee domination, economic, political, and a variety of things. And, for us to go down and say, "We are going to provide assistance if you toe the mark as we dictate it; 1, 2, 3, 4, 5," that is precisely the way to create ill will for this country and not to create the right kind of an impression. The second thing that comes across to me as I converse with my colleagues and as I listen to debate not only on this amendment, but on others, what comes across is that we do not want another Cuba—we do not want another Cuba. But, if there is one thing that we should have learned through the Cuban experience it is that we do not just cut a country off.

My friend from Maryland, even if his amendment is adopted, I am reasonably sure he is going to vote against the bill. He is preoccupied reading the Congressional Quarterly right now, and I am not sure which way he is likely to go, but if his amendment were to be adopted I do not think he would be voting for the

adoption of the bill. At least, I would be very surprised.

What we are in the process of doing if we vote for this amendment, if we kill this bill, is to repeat the mistake we have made in Cuba, to cut ourselves off from communication with another country. I am told that in international meetings, I am told in the international arena, that there are only two nations that, no matter what the posture of the Soviet Union, they follow it completely. They are Bulgaria and Cuba. Let us then learn the lessons from Cuba. Let us not cut people off from communication, and I am afraid that is what we are doing if we kill this bill.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we have to take a look at what we are doing not only in this bill, but in a great many others. We ought to be resolving doubt on international issues in favor of an administration—and I said this when Gerald Ford was President—and in favor of committees. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin and his colleagues on that committee know a great deal more about this question than I do and than most of us, and I rely on their judgment unless I have some overwhelming evidence to the contrary. I think we ought to be relying on them, and I am sure my colleague from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) agrees with that sentiment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMON. I will be pleased to yield to my colleague.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague from Illinois for yielding. Did the gentleman vote for the \$60 million to Angola that was requested by President Ford?

Mr. SIMON. I did.

Mr. HYDE. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. SIMON. And in retrospect, that was a vote that I can say that I am proud of. It is the kind of flexibility that I think we ought to be giving an administration. Let us not create more Cubas. One of the ways we do it is by defeating this amendment and passing this bill.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I was inspired by the comments of my respected colleague from Illinois (Mr. SIMON), especially when he pointed out in such an almost heartrending fashion that we should be supporting committees and we should be supporting the President. I still do not understand how he reaches that conclusion now, after having endorsed the senior Senator from Massachusetts for President.

But I realize we are not speaking of politics; we are speaking of practical diplomatic matters.

I would like to point out that we did not cause Castro. It was not our action. Castro, when he shot his way into control in Havana, was totally committed to the Soviet Union because that is where his support came from. Any gesture we may have made, in my judgment, would not have changed it at all. Castro was taking full control of a government.

Our concern here is basically this: Is it too late in Nicaragua? On this debate we are having, and having watched that Sandinista group shoot its way into power with the direct support of the Cubans and, therefore, the backup support of the Soviets, one wonders if they are free to do anything but become the mini-Cuba there in Central America. That is what our concern is. That is what all the debate and the amendments have been about in the last 2 days.

I commend the gentleman for his support for the committee. I point out with all due respect to the committee that sometimes their eagerness to jump through the hoop for State Department directives it casts a shadow on their otherwise profound knowledge of foreign affairs.

I support the Murphy-Bauman amendments.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in unequivocal support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland. In fact, what we are talking about here is a concept, an American concept of the freedom of the individual as opposed to complete domination of the individual by government, which is exactly what is taking place in Nicaragua.

My colleague from Illinois tells us that government fought its way to power. It did, and I have said before that in all of the governments that have been taken over by international communism, the takeover was from the top, not from the bottom up, and that includes Mother Russia.

The concept that the government should control everything and dictate every item that will apply to a citizen from birth to death is the concept of international communism—complete and total and brutal tyranny. Our concept, on the other hand, is one of freedom of the individual. When we fought our revolution, the revolution was fought for different reasons. One, we had no representation. We had lived under a concept of free men at that time for about 800, and maybe longer—maybe 1,800 years, and wished to elect and name our own governors. If we look in Jefferson's Memorial here, on those hallowed walls we see the writing in stone which says, referring to liberty:

Let us swear eternal vigilance against every form of tyranny over the minds of men.

That expresses what America is all about.

□ 1440

This amendment will assure that free elections will take place, and if they do not take place, then we will not be supporting a concept of government which totally opposes everything that our Government, our citizens, and our history tell us we stand for.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. RUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding.

I ask the gentleman: who in his

opinion really controls Nicaragua at the present time? Is it controlled by a group of moderate citizens?

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, let me answer that question. Everything I have heard tells me that the government of Nicaragua—we can call it a 9-man committee, a 4-man junta, a 5-man junta, or whatever we want—is controlled by people who believe in the Communist doctrines. They take their instructions and their ideas from Cuba, from Russia.

This has been proven. Public source information tells us that Castro has set foot in Nicaragua clandestinely and has supported this Communist revolutionary effort in every way possible, with the transfer of arms and even personnel and espionage agents from Cuba to do the job in Nicaragua. They have targeted, since it has been mentioned, El Salvador, Honduras, and ultimately Guatemala.

And if we think our friend, Mexico, on our southern border is in favor of our support of the terrorist government in Nicaragua—I think not. They must be frightened that the United States, which is held in high esteem by our friends in Latin America, is not providing leadership. They look to the United States for leadership to assure that foreign encroachment from Moscow will not take over the governments of Latin America. They see that that leadership has fallen short, and even our friend, Mexico, is beginning to wonder about us, and they are wondering where they should go because we are not providing that leadership.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, into whose hands would these millions of dollars actually go?

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, there is no control over it. The supposed identified Government in Nicaragua, which is a Communist government in my opinion by everything I have heard, will distribute it however they want to distribute it. They will have our tax moneys, we have no control over how they spend it, and if they take the money and buy goods from Cuba or Russia, that in turn hurts us also.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask further, is not Nicaragua at the present time actually dominated by foreign powers? I was not here during the previous session, but my question stands. Is what I have said about domination true?

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, every piece of information that comes to me indicates that what the gentleman is saying is right on target.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding. Mil Garcias, Senor. Vaya Condios.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the question was asked by the gentleman from Iowa—and I think it is a legitimate question and a good question—

Why are we attempting to impose the condition of free elections that we have not imposed on other countries?

It is a good question, but I think there is a better answer. The answer is that this is a very unique situation. The title of the bill itself indicates how unique it is: "Special Central American Assistance Act of 1979."

We have been told that the reason for voting for this legislation is to create or promote a pluralistic society in Nicaragua.

We heard earlier about the "free press" in Nicaragua. We were told today—and mentioned it yesterday or Friday, I believe—that one newspaper, admittedly a leftist newspaper—but it is a newspaper that has been operating in Nicaragua for a long, long time, even during the time of Somoza, even though it was in very strong opposition to him—has been closed down.

Lest you think that LaPrensa is not under attack or not under the threat of being closed down itself, let me read to the Members what Cmdr. Bayardo Arce, a member of the Sandinista National Directorate, had to say about that in explaining why the newspaper El Pueblo was closed down:

Therefore a measure has been taken against an organ of the counterrevolution. The counterrevolution consists not only of military attacks on the revolutionary process; it also involves political attacks, the type of underhanded attack that was being carried out by El Pueblo, as is being done by other media which, unless they change their attitude, will have to receive the same medicine.

With regard to the State council membership that was mentioned earlier, I believe by the gentleman from Michigan, the State council which was supposed to have been formed last year and which is now put off until May may not exactly bear a resemblance to the description we heard earlier this afternoon.

Comdr. Daniel Ortega, another member of the Sandinista National Directorate, is quoted in the Foreign Broadcast Information Service as saying this:

Many people believe the State Council is something similar to the Somozist congress in which seats were occupied simply for membership's sake. We are not going to allow benchwarmers here. Those who believe we are going to allow benchwarming in this country are very mistaken. Conservatives, Social Democrats and other political parties fought for seats in Somoza's congress, playing the game of the dictatorship, while thousands of youths were shedding their blood in the mountains and cities. This concept of benchwarming must disappear. We do not want benchwarmers. We want true representatives of the people in the State Council and that is why it will be reorganized.

So, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Members that this amendment is very badly needed, and this is a special situation. We are being asked, as has been pointed out many times already, to provide \$75 million of taxpayers' money—money that will have to be borrowed and that, incidentally, will be loaned to the Sandinista at a very low interest rate—to a Marxist-leaning government. I will put it that way, in the most charitable

sense. The money would go to a Marxist-leaning government.

I do not know of any other situation we have in the world that is akin to this one. This is a very special circumstance.

Mr. Chairman, I think it calls for very special conditions and restrictions, and I urge that the Bauman amendment be adopted.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite clear, of course, that the purpose of the amendment offered to the substitute is to make the substitute similar to the original amendment. Under the amendment we would have a condition laid down by law which would be totally unacceptable because of the fact that it is a dictation by one government to another government on what it should do, how it should do it, and when it should do it. We have already heard, of course, that we do not lay this condition for aid on any other government.

I want to emphasize that it is one thing to say that the U.S. Government should negotiate with another government with respect to the things we would like to see done, as was done by previous administrations in this country and as has been done with many other countries in Latin America on the question of elections. It is a matter of judgment as to just when and how and under what conditions particular governments can be able to hold free elections. In some countries we do not have any evidence yet that the governments will hold elections in the foreseeable future. Chile is one, for example. But in other countries there has been good work, with the aid and assistance of the United States—in Peru and Ecuador and other countries where movement has been made and actual positions have been taken with respect to the holding of free elections and otherwise liberalizing the political systems.

That is one thing. It is another thing to write in the law that we want cloned specifically a proposition that impinges directly on the sovereignty of another government. It is one thing to negotiate; it is another thing to write mandates into the law.

A suggestion was made here that other countries in Central America and around the periphery are concerned about what is happening in Nicaragua. Yes, they are. But it is not fear. Mexico, for example, is providing assistance to the tune of \$4 million, I will tell my friend who spoke earlier. And other countries in the region are likewise providing funds. The total list is in the record—Sweden, Spain, Venezuela, West Germany—\$270 million so far—not to mention the international financial institutions which are providing some \$300 million to date and which will lay down whatever conditions are necessary or that they think are necessary economically or fiscally in order to have the Nicaraguan Government participate in whatever arrangements at the international level might be deemed necessary. But in no case have the con-



ditions been laid down by law; it has been a process of negotiation.

As far as the press is concerned, the most important paper in Nicaragua still is publishing, although it is under pressure. I have talked to that editor and other people in that family, and they are strong and they are determined. Their paper is now being printed at another private plant just up the road a ways. They are still publishing and they are still delivering their newspaper. They intend to fight. The West Germans gave them the money to rebuild their plant and bring in new printing equipment and they are going to make a fight of it.

□ 1450

Some of you want to prejudge this whole thing and say that the fight is all over, shut the door, turn your back on the church, turn your back on the free press that exists, turn your back on the private enterprise that exists and its potential there, give them no chance, write all of the rigid conditions that you want in this law, make them eat your sovereignty, make them give up what limited sovereignty they have in order to clone a concept that you want.

The more reasonable position with respect to the question of elections is taken by the substitute which says yes, we like that concept, we expect our Government to lean on them a little bit, to keep pushing this matter, as we have done with other governments. We have been successful in some cases; in some cases we have not been successful. But it is far better to try to achieve this goal by negotiation than it is to write it into law either as a condition subsequent or as a condition precedent.

I would hope therefore that my colleagues would vote against the amendment to the substitute, and would vote for the substitute and then for the amendment as amended.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Florida. He has corrected some statements that were erroneous, and I have asked him to yield not only to commend him for his statement, but also to say and, I am sure the gentleman will agree, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) is merely a reincarnation of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FASCELL. The chairman is absolutely right. All the amendment that the gentleman from Maryland has offered does is to put the same objection in the substitute that exists in the original amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) has expired.

(On request of Mr. ZABLOCKI and by unanimous consent, Mr. FASCELL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman will yield further, there has been some erroneous information given to us. I am sure that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN), my highly esteemed and dear friend, will sleep better if I allay his concern that, as a result of his meeting and his visit with Mr. Arturo Cruz of the Central Bank, that Mr. Arturo Cruz has resigned. Contrary to what the gentleman from California told us, my information is that he has not resigned, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) need not worry that he has caused problems for Mr. Cruz.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman give me the phone number in Managua that he is using today?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Maryland knows that I use the same number he does.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RUDD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would only like to point out that the government that is existing or the controlling force in Nicaragua today is a small cadre of gun-toting, bomb-throwing terrorists, and we are not talking about the general population of the people of Nicaragua. Nicaraguans are good Christian people. They are people like Americans who want to make a better life for themselves. What we need to do is to give them an opportunity to do so, and if we prop up this gun-toting government, then we have not only helped international communism, helped this particular government, but we have hurt the entire population of Nicaragua. We can help them if our diplomatic representatives will take to the streets and become more interested in what the common man is doing and what the storeowners are doing and what the middle sector are doing than they are. We would be able to reach the broad, vast majority of the people in Nicaragua to help them to form a government which would be a government that they could respect and support and which would not oppose the United States of America from our back doorstep.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have agonized over this entire bill, not to mention this amendment, and as far as I am concerned, I am not going to support the amendment of my dear friend from Maryland because, frankly, I think if you are against the bill you should vote against the bill. But I think to hamper this bill with demeaning and even insulting conditions to a country that is attempting to struggle to its feet, that

is attempting to maintain some dignity and some sovereignty, and to give them the excuse to say, "More Yankee imperialism, you are going to have an election by such-and-such a date," I think totally negates any advantage that might accrue by seeking to have some influence with this government by giving them this money.

If this government is at all salvageable, if this country is 5-percent salvageable, I do not think we should give them the money and then throw any benefits to us away by putting unacceptable and impossible conditions to its acceptance. We should have elections.

Two years ought to be plenty of time to have an election. If 2 years goes by and there is no election, I would be very, very disappointed, and it would give evidence and credence to the argument that indeed they are not going to be a free country. But today, as I say, when they are struggling to their feet, I think it totally frustrates the purpose of this loan; and I say if you are really against the loan, then vote against it, but do not rub anybody's faces into setting deadlines that are demeaning and that detract from the dignity of one sovereign nation to one attempting to be sovereign.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there are few Members of the House whose motivation and whose judgment I respect more than the gentleman from Illinois.

The gentleman knows that I stand with him on many propositions. But if the gentleman from Illinois wants to hear the anti-imperialistic statements, the Yankee-aggressor statements, he need only to read the 7 months of speeches by the heads of this Nicaragua Government. They have castigated the United States at every turn. The gentleman and I have not arrived at the same judgment on this bill. My judgment is that Nicaragua is already gone.

But I would like to see the Communists in Nicaragua confronted with the proposition: "If you wish your people to be economically benefited, let them have free elections." The gentleman feels that there is still some hope. This amendment might turn them off completely and they might refuse the loan. We have arrived at different judgments. But I think if you want to hear those speeches attacking the United States they already have been made. The characterization of the U.S. Government as the villain is replete. On the government controlled radio, television and in La Barricada newspaper they have called us every horrible name already. They tell us this bill is indemnification for past sins. So my guess is that the gentleman is probably wrong. I hope he is right. But I do not think this amendment demeans anybody. It only imposes upon the Nicaraguan Government what some thought they were fighting for and what they said they were fighting for: freedom.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona a question or so about this very serious matter which confronts. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman who really is in charge of the schools in Nicaragua.

Mr. RUDD. If the gentleman will yield, I will respond to the gentleman from Kentucky in this way: Public source information indicates—and I am talking about the Foreign Broadcast Information Service material and information—that there are 1,200 so-called teachers, Cuban teachers, in Nicaragua, who are sent there by Fidel Castro with admonitions that they are to carry out the—

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has expired.

(On request of Mr. CARTER and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILMAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. RUDD. Couple that with the fact that there are presumably about a thousand Cuban doctors there. This is by public information sources. And with regard to the teachers, this is information which Fidel Castro has stated was accurate, if you can believe him. And if you can believe him at all, you can believe it is probably larger than that.

So this is what is going on in Nicaragua. Each one of those representatives, call them teacher, doctor, representatives of Cuba from any source at all, you better believe that their primary mission is to engage in intelligence-type activities.

Mr. CARTER. I will ask the gentleman further if he would answer this question: Who really is in charge of training the police of Nicaragua at the present time?

Mr. RUDD. It is difficult for me to respond to that question because I really do not know.

Mr. CARTER. I was not in that meeting, but I would just like to know.

Further, I will ask the distinguished gentleman this question: Why are we permitting a battalion of Soviet troops to remain in Cuba? Could the gentleman answer that?

Mr. RUDD. I think you would have to ask the President that question for a response.

Mr. CARTER. Why are we permitting a number of Russian TU-54 bombers to remain there in Cuba at the present time? Is not this a threat to Central America?

Mr. RUDD. Let me respond in this way: I do not know how accurate the morning newspaper is, but the newspaper this morning carried articles on both of these subjects that the gentleman brings up, indicating that there was an expansion of Soviet troops in Cuba, indicating that there was an expansion and an increase in the number of Soviet aircraft that were there.

□ 1500

They were lengthening the runways. That is public source material, and I as-

sume that the sources for that, the distinguished media, would be accurate.

Mr. CARTER. One last question: I would like to ask the gentleman, has not it been evident to him—

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has expired.

(At the request of Mr. CARTER and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, has it not been evident to the gentleman that since we gave up the Panama Canal that we also at the same time really in effect gave up Central America? Is that correct in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. RUDD. That we gave up the Panama Canal?

Mr. CARTER. That we gave up Central America?

Mr. RUDD. I think probably we gave up a little bit of Central America. When the gentleman says "gave up," we gave up our friendship with these countries when we permitted Fidel Castro to do what he has done in taking over and abusing the Cuban people and expanding his revolution throughout Latin America, and we have not tried to dissuade that or stop that in 20 years.

Mr. CARTER. What has been the conduit of supplies going into Guatemala and so on?

Mr. RUDD. Public source information indicates that it came through Cuba into Guatemala and Nicaragua.

Mr. CARTER. Vaya con dios.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I shall try to be very brief. I would just like to respond briefly to my friend from Maryland who was talking about the rhetoric and the press releases. Macho rhetoric is not unique to Central American politicians or other politicians throughout the world. I have been guilty myself many times, and I hope I get the chance to be guilty in the future, too.

Let me just quickly tell the Members a story that President Marcos told me in January of this year.

He said he talked to Sukarno, who was the President then of Indonesia and a militant, vituperative anti-American. He said, after a particularly bitter speech of his, "President Sukarno, did you really mean that?"

Marcos related to me that Sukarno said to him:

Keep the 7th Fleet here and the 13th Airborne and you will be all right.

So it seems what they say for public consumption and what they really feel may be an entirely different thing.

Point two, I have no way of knowing whether or not Nicaragua is gone. I am extremely pessimistic.

The last thing in the world I want is another Communist enclave, another client state of the Soviet Union, in Central America, but I do not want to slam the door. I want someone else to slam the door.

I want to try to put my foot in the door, if possible, and if this \$75 million, which

is not all that consequential, given the billions of dollars that are involved in foreign aid, can keep a foot in the door, can provide some influence with those people who certainly are not deaf, dumb, and blind and can see what an utter failure Cuba is, and when they get over their reaction to the fact the Imperialists from the North have been trying to impose their will on Central America, common-sense may prevail. If it does not, it will be tragic, and sad, and our national interest will be compromised. But I want someone else to slam the door on the loss of Nicaragua. There is a Catholic church down there. There is a private sector, however beleaguered. There is a press, more or less free. I want to nurture those things, not extinguish them.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just wanted to say to my colleague, that when he is wrong, he is eloquently wrong.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state, as an American, as a Hispanic, as a Member of Congress, my unequivocal support for the passage of the Special Central American Assistance Act which would authorize \$75 million to assist in the reconstruction of Nicaragua's devastated economy.

Most Americans do not seem to realize the extent of the economic ruin and of the human suffering brought about by the civil war in Nicaragua last year. As a small, poor country, Nicaragua is unable to finance the \$1.93 billion required to rebuild the country. Nicaragua desperately needs Western economic support to get its economy moving again. Presently, between 33 and 40 percent of Nicaragua's labor force is unemployed. Around 750,000 Nicaraguans are dependent on food assistance. Approximately 200,000 people are homeless. Even more terrible are the casualty statistics. Out of a population of only 2.4 million the civil war resulted in the death of 40,000, the orphaning of another 40,000 children and the wounding of 100,000 people. We cannot as a Nation turn a blind eye to such human suffering occurring at our very own doorstep.

Providing economic aid to the new Nicaraguan Government is not only a humanitarian gesture but also an act of pragmatic self-interest. Today the political destiny of Nicaragua is uncertain. The Sandinista movement contains Marxist elements who would like to pattern Nicaragua after Cuba. But it is dangerously erroneous to believe that the Marxist elements within the Sandinistas control the country. There are in fact powerful individuals and groups within Nicaragua committed to promoting an open pluralistic political system. In the five person ruling junta, two are moderate conservatives and one is a social



democrat. The press, the business community, the unions, and the church are all working for the establishment of a pluralistic Nicaragua. It is vital that the United States demonstrate its willingness to assist the Nicaraguan moderates in their struggle to shape the structure of the country's political system.

As a result, H.R. 6081 has a symbolic importance that far outweighs the \$75 million in aid at stake. As the New York Times recently editorialized:

If Congress shows itself unwilling to support the struggle for Nicaraguan democracy, how can it expect anyone in Nicaragua to wage the same fight? Nicaraguan democrats would pay with their heads.

The recent actions taken by the new Nicaraguan Government demonstrate that the moderates within the Government wield considerable power. It is instructive to compare post-revolutionary Nicaragua with post-revolutionary Cuba. In Nicaragua, unlike in Cuba, the new revolutionary government has not held show trials, it has not allowed the execution of defeated opponents, it has not allowed reprisals against Somoza's detested national guard, it has not muzzled the press, it has not taken over the trade unions, it has not closed down the professional associations, it has not harassed the Catholic Church. The only land, the only property that the new Nicaraguan Government has expropriated has been that of the Somoza family. And the new Nicaraguan Government has scrupulously refrained from interfering in the internal affairs of its Central American neighbors.

The logic of assisting Nicaraguan moderates by providing economic aid has been clearly understood by America's allies. West Germany, Venezuela, Spain, The Netherlands, the other Central American nations have together contributed almost \$200 million in aid. Recently, the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States passed a unanimous resolution which urged the member states to provide all possible assistance to bring about the economic and social recovery of Nicaragua. The passage of H.R. 6081 would fulfill the U.S. pledge to help the people of Nicaragua.

In conclusion, I can think of no better way of encouraging Nicaragua's tentative moves toward an open pluralistic political system than by extending American financial aid to that war wrecked nation. I can think of no better way of inhibiting Cuban and hence Soviet influence than by passing H.R. 6081.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARCIA. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I would like to commend the gentleman on his remarks, and also the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

I think perhaps this is an appropriate moment to focus on the larger issue. I know we are going to be voting on a specific amendment in a moment, but the larger issue really is whether we are going to preserve a stake in the possibility for a future for Nicaragua and her people

which is going to be more optimistic than perhaps some have suggested.

Let me quote, if I might, from a letter that the National Commander in Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars wrote recently to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI). I know the chairman has already alluded to this letter, and it has been circulated among interested Members. Directly addressing the point raised by the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Howard Vander Clute says the following:

We cannot "run the film backwards." Perhaps there was, at some point, an alternative to Somoza rule, other than the Sandinistas, that might have been practical earlier. But if there was a lost choice, then I see no choice today.

The young junta may follow the Cuban model; I do not know. But I do know we must offer them a real policy choice.

The devastation left in the wake of the revolution is sickening. This I saw with my own eyes and, as a Christian, I can do no less than to urge swift and compassionate American assistance.

I urge prompt passage of the \$75 million aid package for Nicaragua.

Mr. Vander Clute is from my district. I have known him for a number of years. I spoke with him on Saturday. He told me that he wanted to let this House know how strongly he felt about this matter.

He also told me that he had in December and January successfully negotiated the release of two naturalized American citizens who had served in our Armed Forces, negotiated their release with the current Government.

They were living in Nicaragua. They were originally Nicaraguans by birth. They have now been released, and perhaps the willingness of the Government to come to a proper final decision on the fate of those Americans is indicative at least of the possibility that we can work, as the gentleman from New York has suggested, and the gentleman from Illinois has suggested, with this Government.

I commend both gentlemen for their statements and urge all Members to vote the assessment and recommendations of the VFW's Commander in Chief, Mr. Howard E. Vander Clute.

□ 1510

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURPHY of New York) there were—ayes 14, noes 21.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 212, not voting 30, as follows:

Abdnor	Grassley	Mottl
Ambro	Grisham	Murphy, N.Y.
Andrews,	Guarini	Murphy, Pa.
N. Dak.	Gudger	Myers, Ind.
Anthony	Guyer	Myers, Pa.
Applegate	Hagedorn	Nichols
Archer	Hall, Tex.	O'Brien
Ashbrook	Hammer-	Oakar
Badham	schmidt	Panetta
Bafalis	Hansen	Paul
Bailey	Harris	Pickle
Barnard	Harsha	Quayle
Bauman	Heckler	Quillen
Benjamin	Hillis	Rallsback
Bennett	Hinson	Regula
Bereuter	Holland	Rinaldo
Bethune	Hollenbeck	Ritter
Boland	Holt	Robinson
Breaux	Hopkins	Rose
Brinkley	Horton	Rostenkowski
Broomfield	Huckaby	Roth
Brown, Ohio	Hutto	Rudd
Broyhill	Ichord	Satterfield
Burgener	Jeffords	Sawyer
Butler	Jeffries	Schulze
Byron	Jennette	Sebelius
Campbell	Jones, N.C.	Sensenbrenner
Carney	Kelly	Shelby
Carter	Kemp	Shumway
Chappell	Kindness	Shuster
Cheney	Kramer	Smith, Nebr.
Clausen	Lagomarsino	Snyder
Coleman	Latta	Solomon
Collins, Tex.	Leath, Tex.	Spence
Conable	Lee	Stack
Conte	Lent	Staggers
Corcoran	Levit	Stangeland
Cotter	Lewis	Stenholm
Coughlin	Livingston	Stockman
Courter	Loeffler	Stratton
Crane, Daniel	Lott	Stump
Daniel, Dan	Lujan	Symms
Daniel, R. W.	Luken	Tauke
Dannemeyer	Lunnen	Taylor
Davis, Mich.	McClary	Thomas
de la Garza	McDade	Traxler
Derrick	McDonald	Tribble
Derwinski	McEwen	Walker
Dickinson	McKay	Wampler
Duncan, Tenn.	McKinney	White
Early	Madigan	Whitehurst
Emery	Marlenee	Whittaker
Erlenborn	Marriott	Williams, Ohio
Ertel	Mathis	Wilson, Bob
Evans, Ind.	Mattox	Wilson, C. H.
Flippo	Mazzoli	Winn
Florio	Mica	Wolf
Forsythe	Michol	Wyatt
Gaydos	Miller, Ohio	Wydler
Gilman	Minish	Wyle
Ginn	Mitchell, N.Y.	Yatron
Goldwater	Moakley	Young, Alaska
Goodling	Montgomery	Young, Fla.
Gradison	Moorhead,	Zeferetti
Gramm	Calif.	

NOES—212

Burton, Phillip	Ferraro
Carr	Findley
Cavanaugh	Fish
Chisholm	Fisher
Clay	Pithian
Clinger	Foley
Coelho	Ford, Mich.
Collins, Ill.	Ford, Tenn.
Corman	Fountain
Danielson	Fowler
Daschle	Frenzel
Deckard	Fuqua
Dellums	Garcia
Dicks	Gephardt
Diggs	Gibbons
Dingell	Gingrich
Dodd	Glickman
Donnelly	Gonzalez
Dougherty	Gore
Downey	Gray
Drinan	Green
Eckhardt	Hall, Ohio
Edgar	Hamilton
Edwards, Calif.	Hance
English	Hanley
Erdahl	Harkin
Evans, Del.	Hawkins
Evans, Ga.	Hefner
Fary	Heftel
Fascell	Hightower
Fazio	Holtzman
Fenwick	Howard

Hubbard  
Hughes  
Hyde  
Ireland  
Jacobs  
Jenkins  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, Colo.  
Jones, Okla.  
Jones, Tenn.  
Kastenmeier  
Kazen  
Kildee  
Kogovsek  
Kostmayer  
LaFalce  
Leach, Iowa  
Leach, La.  
Lederer  
Lehman  
Leland  
Lloyd  
Long, La.  
Long, Md.  
Lowry  
Lundine  
McCormack  
McHugh  
Maguire  
Markay  
Marks  
Martin  
Matsui  
Mavroules  
Mikulski  
Miller, Calif.  
Mineta  
Moffett  
Mollohan

Moorhead, Pa.  
Murtha  
Natcher  
Neal  
Nedzi  
Nelson  
Nolan  
Nowak  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Ottinger  
Pashayan  
Patten  
Patterson  
Pease  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Petri  
Peyser  
Porter  
Preyer  
Price  
Pritchard  
Pursell  
Rahall  
Reuss  
Rhodes  
Richmond  
Roberts  
Rodino  
Roe  
Rosenthal  
Roybal  
Royer  
Russo  
Sabo  
Scheuer  
Schroeder  
Seiberling

Shannon  
Sharp  
Simon  
Skeiton  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Snowe  
Solarz  
Spellman  
St Germain  
Stanton  
Stark  
Steed  
Stewart  
Stokes  
Studds  
Swift  
Synar  
Thompson  
Udall  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vento  
Volkmer  
Walgren  
Watkins  
Waxman  
Weaver  
Weiss  
Whitely  
Whitten  
Williams, Mont.  
Wilson, Tex.  
Wirth  
Wolpe  
Wright  
Yates  
Young, Mo.  
Zablocki

## NOT VOTING—30

Alexander  
Anderson, Ill.  
Biaggi  
Boner  
Brown, Calif.  
Cleveland  
Conyers  
Crane, Philip  
D'Amours  
Davis, S.C.

Devine  
Dixon  
Dornan  
Duncan, Oreg.  
Edwards, Ala.  
Edwards, Okla.  
Frost  
Gialmo  
McCloskey  
Mitchell, Md.

Moore  
Murphy, Ill.  
Rangel  
Ratchford  
Rousselot  
Runnels  
Santini  
Treen  
Vander Jagt  
Vanik

□ 1520

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rousselot for, with Mr. Biaggi against.  
Mr. Moore for, with Mr. Dixon against.  
Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Conyers against.  
Mr. Philip M. Crane for, with Mr. Mitchell of Maryland against.  
Mr. Runnels for, with Mr. Rangel against.

So the amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY).

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY), as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—ayes 400, nays 0, answered "present" 3, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

## AYES—400

Abdnor  
Addabbo  
Akaka  
Albosta  
Ambro  
Anderson, Calif.  
Andrews, N.C.  
Andrews, N. Dak.  
Annunzio  
Anthony  
Applegate  
Archer  
Ashbrook  
Ashley  
Aspin  
Atkinson  
AuCoin  
Badham  
Bafalis  
Bailey  
Baldus  
Barnard  
Barnes  
Bauman  
Beard, R.I.  
Beard, Tenn.  
Bedell  
Bellenson  
Benjamin  
Bennett  
Bereuter  
Bethune  
Bevill  
Bingham  
Blanchard  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bolling  
Bonior  
Bouquard  
Bowen  
Brademas  
Breaux  
Brinkley  
Brookhead  
Brooks  
Broomfield  
Brown, Calif.  
Brown, Ohio  
Broyhill  
Buchanan  
Burgener  
Burlison  
Burton, John  
Burton, Phillip  
Butler  
Byron  
Campbell  
Carney  
Carr  
Carter  
Cavanaugh  
Chappell  
Cheney  
Chisholm  
Clausen  
Clay  
Clinger  
Coelho  
Coleman  
Collins, Ill.  
Collins, Tex.  
Conable  
Conte  
Corcoran  
Corman  
Cotter  
Coughlin  
Courter  
Crane, Daniel  
Daniel, Dan  
Daniel, R. W.  
Danielson  
Dannemeyer  
Daschle  
Davis, Mich.  
de la Garza  
Deckard  
Dellums  
Derrick  
Derwinski  
Dickinson  
Dicks  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Dodd  
Donnelly

Dougherty  
Downey  
Drinan  
Duncan, Tenn.  
Early  
Eckhardt  
Edgar  
Edwards, Calif.  
Emery  
English  
Erdahl  
Erlenborn  
Ertel  
Evans, Del.  
Evans, Ga.  
Evans, Ind.  
Fary  
Fascell  
Fazio  
Fenwick  
Ferraro  
Findley  
Fish  
Fisher  
Fithian  
Filippo  
Florio  
Foley  
Ford, Mich.  
Ford, Tenn.  
Forsythe  
Fountain  
Fowler  
Frenzel  
Fuqua  
Garcia  
Gaydos  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Ginn  
Glickman  
Goldwater  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Gore  
Gradison  
Gramm  
Grassley  
Gray  
Green  
Grisham  
Guarini  
Gudger  
Hagedorn  
Hall, Ohio  
Hall, Tex.  
Hamilton  
Hammer  
Hansmidt  
Hance  
Hanley  
Hansen  
Harkin  
Harris  
Harsha  
Hawkins  
Heckler  
Hefner  
Hefel  
Hightower  
Hillis  
Hinson  
Holland  
Hollenbeck  
Holt  
Holtzman  
Hopkins  
Horton  
Howard  
Hubbard  
Huckaby  
Hughes  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Ichord  
Ireland  
Jacobs  
Jeffords  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Jenrette  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, Colo.  
Jones, N.C.  
Jones, Okla.  
Jones, Tenn.

Kastenmeier  
Kazen  
Kelly  
Kemp  
Kildee  
Kindness  
Kogovsek  
Kostmayer  
Kramer  
LaFalce  
Lagomarsino  
Latta  
Leach, Iowa  
Leach, La.  
Leath, Tex.  
Lederer  
Lee  
Lehman  
Leland  
Lent  
Levitas  
Lewis  
Livingston  
Lloyd  
Loeffler  
Long, Md.  
Lott  
Lowry  
Lujan  
Luken  
Lundine  
Lungren  
McClory  
McCormack  
McDade  
McEwen  
McHugh  
McKay  
McKinney  
Madigan  
Maguire  
Marks  
Marlenee  
Marriott  
Martin  
Mathis  
Matsui  
Mattox  
Mavroules  
Mazzoli  
Mica  
Michel  
Mikulski  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Ohio  
Mineta  
Mintish  
Mitchell, Md.  
Mitchell, N.Y.  
Moakley  
Moffett  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead, Calif.  
Moorhead, Pa.  
Mottl  
Murphy, Pa.  
Myers, Ind.  
Myers, Pa.  
Natcher  
Neal  
Nedzi  
Nelson  
Nichols  
Nolan  
Nowak  
O'Brien  
Oakar  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Ottinger  
Panetta  
Pashayan  
Patten  
Fatterson  
Paul  
Pease  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Petri  
Peyser  
Pickle  
Porter  
Preyer  
Price  
Pritchard  
Pursell

Quayle  
Quillen  
Rahall  
Rallsback  
Rangel  
Regula  
Reuss  
Rhodes  
Richmond  
Rinaldo  
Ritter  
Roberts  
Robinson  
Rodino  
Roe  
Rose  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roybal  
Royer  
Rudd  
Runnels  
Russo  
Sabo  
Satterfield  
Sawyer  
Scheuer  
Schroeder  
Schulze  
Sebellius  
Seiberling  
Sensenbrenner  
Shannon  
Sharp  
Shumway

Shuster  
Simon  
Skelton  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, Nebr.  
Snowe  
Snyder  
Solarz  
Solomon  
Spellman  
Spence  
St Germain  
Stack  
Staggers  
Stangeland  
Stanton  
Stark  
Steed  
Stenholm  
Stewart  
Stockman  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stump  
Swift  
Symms  
Synar  
Tauke  
Taylor  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Traxler  
Trible  
Udall  
Ullman

Van Deerlin  
Vento  
Volkmer  
Walgren  
Walker  
Wampler  
Watkins  
Waxman  
Weaver  
Weiss  
White  
Whitehurst  
Whitley  
Whittaker  
Whitten  
Williams, Mont.  
Williams, Ohio  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson, C. H.  
Wilson, Tex.  
Winn  
Wirth  
Wolf  
Wolpe  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Wyder  
Wylie  
Yates  
Yatron  
Young, Alaska  
Young, Fla.  
Young, Mo.  
Zablocki  
Zeferetti

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

McDonald  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Stratton

## NOT VOTING—30

Alexander  
Anderson, Ill.  
Biaggi  
Boner  
Bonker  
Cleveland  
Conyers  
Crane, Philip  
D'Amours  
Davis, S.C.

Devine  
Dixon  
Dornan  
Duncan, Oreg.  
Edwards, Ala.  
Edwards, Okla.  
Frost  
Gialmo  
Long, La.  
McCloskey

Moore  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murtha  
Ratchford  
Rousselot  
Santini  
Shelby  
Treen  
Vander Jagt  
Vanik

□ 1540

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILMAN: Page 2, line 19, immediately after "(b)" insert "(1)"; and

Immediately after line 24 insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1) of subsection (b), 39 per centum shall be available for assistance to Guatemala, 26 per centum shall be available for El Salvador, 21 per centum shall be available for Honduras, and 14 per centum shall be available for Nicaragua."

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, a major argument offered by the proponents of this legislation is an appeal to aid those sectors of the Nicaraguan society who share with us similar beliefs in the protection of human rights, democracy, and a pluralistic society. It is stated that the Marxist influence of the current government should be challenged and that U.S. support for the private sector will provide that diversity of viewpoint. The chances of success, however, given the current strength of the Sandinistas, is rated by the Department of State as "a long shot gamble" at best.



My concern regarding the administration's Central American policy is the lack of evenhandedness in its approach. While we are now being forced to place all of our bets on the few remaining moderate forces left in Nicaragua due to the Sandinista victory, we do not face those same odds in the other nations of the Central American region.

The stability of the northeast tier of Central America is being threatened. El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras all share the same mixture of political, social, and economic unrest that led to Nicaragua's violent revolution, yet the majority of the moderate elements within these nations remain ready, willing, and able to help bring about peaceful solutions.

It is in these three traditionally friendly nations, where our assistance can do the most to help foster moderate change. In Nicaragua where the revolution has come and gone, we are left with only a hope of moderating the forces of the extreme.

Since the Sandinista victory last July, the United States had demonstrated its concern for the welfare and friendship of the Nicaraguan people. In the past 7 months, we have provided \$71.8 million in assistance to help that nation recover from the destruction of war and build for a better future. In addition, the administration's fiscal year 1981 foreign aid proposals now before the Foreign Affairs Committee, calls for an additional \$50.4 million in assistance including \$5.5 million in military aid. If we add to that the \$75 million in the bill now before the House, the administration's package for the new Sandinista government totals some \$197.2 million, not to mention the hundreds of millions of funding provided through the International Financial Institutions.

In the other three northern tier nations, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras they too are suffering from severe economic difficulties that provide the breeding grounds for revolution. Yet the bulk of our assistance is earmarked for Nicaragua. In El Salvador the comparable fiscal year 1980 and fiscal year 1981 aid levels total \$71.1 million. In Honduras that total is \$84.4 million. And the total for Guatemala is only \$23.8 million. Combined, the aid proposal for all three of these long-standing allies is only \$184.3 million, or \$12 million less than the total for Nicaragua alone.

While the legislation now before us, H.R. 6081, is entitled the "Special Central American Assistance Act," \$75 million or more than 90 percent of the funds in this bill are for Nicaragua. The only other nation earmarked for funds in this legislation is Honduras, which is to receive only a token \$5 million. For this reason, I am offering this amendment that would redistribute the \$80 million in the bill more equitably among four northern tier nations, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras.

Under my amendment, the recommended aid proposal for Central America would be based on the population totals of each of the four nations involved.

Guatemala, with 39 percent of the population in the region (6.8 million) would receive \$31.2 million. El Salvador, with 26 percent of the population (4.6 million) would receive \$20.8 million. Honduras, with 21 percent (3.6 million) would receive \$16.8 million and Nicaragua, with 14 percent (or 2.4 million in population) would receive \$11.2 million.

I urge my colleagues to fully consider the current imbalance in our proposed Central American response and to support my amendment which seeks to balance our aid among all of the nations in this region to help them solve their internal problems and to thwart Cuba's influence.

Without this amendment, the wrong signal will be sent to our friends throughout the globe. We would be telling the world that the United States is unwilling or unable to aid our troubled traditional allies until after their greatest hour of need.

It makes little sense to concentrate so much effort in trying to close the barn door in Nicaragua after the horse is gone, while, at the same time, we neglect to adequately respond to the internal threats to its neighbors where our chances of success in bringing about a peaceful moderate change are far less of a gamble. My amendment offers the House an opportunity to correct such an imbalance and to truly provide significant assistance that more accurately reflects our interests and goals in Central America as well as the prospects of achieving them.

□ 1550

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, frankly, I would be less than honest if I did not say that I am disappointed that the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), a member of the committee, would propose such an amendment, an amendment which he claims is to bring balance to assistance to be provided under the act.

The bill before us, purely and simply, is legislation to help a country that has been devastated by a civil war and is in need of our assistance. In short the purpose of the bill is to aid the people of Nicaragua, the private sector and those in that country who are striving to insure that Nicaragua will have a free and independent government. That is the purpose of this legislation.

Instead the gentleman from New York proposes that we split the funds to be authorized for Nicaragua with three other countries in Central America.

I am puzzled by the figures presented by the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I will yield in just a moment, but first I want to give my figures. They are from the books that are available to us and the statistics that are available to us.

Mr. Chairman, our aid to Nicaragua in fiscal year 1979 was \$28 million. For 1980, \$90 million is proposed, and for fiscal year 1981 \$53.7 million is proposed. Now,

the gentleman has, I believe, said that the United States provided Nicaragua with \$72 million in fiscal year 1979.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in fiscal year 1980 there was \$24.5 million for initial relief and rehabilitation. There was \$33.2 million for reactivated existing loans and grant programs withheld from the Somoza government, plus \$14.1 million for reprogramming of Public Law 480, for a total of \$71.8 million in aid to Nicaragua since the Sandinista victory and under executive authority.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that is indeed double accounting, because the gentleman is including with the assistance actually provided in fiscal year 1979 some \$33 million that was already in the pipeline, only \$3 million of which has been expended since July 1979. He is including that over and above the other figure. That is double accounting, I submit, Mr. Chairman.

As far as the gentleman's statement that the bill before us would give the wrong signal to other Central American countries, I would advise the gentleman from New York that the countries of Central America have provided emergency assistance to Nicaragua and are obviously in support of U.S. assistance to Nicaragua, and I refer to El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, and Panama. They also have provided more than \$100 million of export credits.

The Organization of American States at its 17th meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, and at its February 13, 1980, Permanent Council meeting, agreed to resolutions urging all members of the OAS "to provide all possible assistance to bring about the economic and social recovery of Nicaragua."

I disagree with the gentleman's argument that this bill will give the wrong signal to other Central American countries. The wrong message would be given if we did not aid Nicaragua. That would be the wrong message.

The gentleman also stated in his remarks that there is an imbalance because of the amount that is provided for Nicaragua, as compared with what we are providing for the other countries of Central America.

□ 1600

The gentleman pointed out that in the case of Honduras we are only providing \$5 million.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ZABLOCKI was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman has evidently forgotten that under proposed reprogramming of aid funds, in fiscal year 1980 El Salvador will receive \$49.8 million in assistance, Honduras \$55 million, and Guatemala \$11.4 million.

This legislation is necessary because Nicaragua's economy was heavily damaged by the long and destructive war. These other countries in Central America which I have enumerated, were not se-

verely damaged, and are not in the same economic straits as Nicaragua. Therefore, it is folly to divide the \$75 million to Central America countries irrespective of their need and based only on population, as the gentleman suggests. As a matter of fact, I know the gentleman is deeply concerned about the population growth. The message that the gentleman will be sending to these countries is that if they grow in population they will get more money. Is that the message the gentleman wants to send to those countries in Central America? I am sure it is not.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman stated that the programs that we have here submitted for Nicaragua and Honduras were out of kilter compared to what their aid was before. The aid and assistance we are giving in reprogramming and in this emergency legislation reflects the need for each country, not on the gentleman's amendment, which is based on a formula that certainly cannot be justified. I hope that the gentleman's amendment will be soundly and roundly defeated because it is not wise economically.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment that we are looking at now demonstrates to me some of the problems that we have in dealing with the subject of foreign aid. I would have to concede that if I felt responsible and obligated to spend \$75 million, I would be inclined, possibly, to support this amendment. However, I would like to question the whole concept of what we are doing today with this foreign aid bill.

I read rather recently in the paper that it was American taxpayers' money under the guise of foreign aid and assistance that helped build a road in Afghanistan and helped to build the Russian trucks that went into Afghanistan, in the recent invasion. Yet now we resort to talking about drafting 18-year-old women and men in order to compensate for those kinds of errors.

For us to be talking today about sending \$75 million of foreign aid down to Nicaragua does not make a lot of sense when you look at what is happening in this country. Look at the huge deficit that we have run up, look at the inflation we currently have in this country, we have serious unemployment problems, we have poverty problems, we have bankruptcies in large companies such as Chrysler. I believe there is economic disaster on the horizon, I believe there is possible runaway inflation in this country, in the new future, and yet we still come here and talk about throwing away \$75 million. We then get into this debate about who we are going to give it to. Are we going to give it to the good guys or to the bad guys? Are we going to give it to the rightwingers or to the leftwingers? Which dictator deserves this money?

I think there is a forgotten cause around here. There is a group that does not seem to have anybody speaking for

them, and that is the American taxpayers.

For us to stand and say that we ought to give this money to dictators such as Somoza, "they are the good guys and pro-Americans," or we should have given it to the Sandinistas because they represent "democracy," it seems to me that we lose a significant part of the argument. Why are we giving it to either one of them? Why do we not let the American people keep their money? They need it desperately. To give away \$75 million under these conditions, is outrageous. I cannot see any reason why it should even be considered.

Also, when we do send this money, so often—as a matter of fact, I think just about all the time—the money never achieves what is intended. If it is supposed to help them economically, how come we never see the economic achievements in the countries where we pour this money? And also it does not even seem to buy us friendship. I do not know of any country who has rallied to us or any countries that we saved by pouring more dollars into them. It seems like it is the American way, because we do not know of anything else to do but to throw more money at a problem. If we have any problem, we just throw money at it. A problem exists in Nicaragua, so we throw more money that way. This never presents to them an alternative system that may be based on some ideas and not on some money. Instead of presenting to them in a way which they could make a choice of an economic system, we send them money that never seems to help. And in doing this we unfortunately adopt the same principles and conditions which are destroying so many other nations, that is, the socialist interventionist principles that has put these nations in need in such a predicament and now is also dragging us in the same direction.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAUL. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman suggesting that maybe the State Department and the U.S. Government would get further if they would export the virtues, the humanitarian aspects of the ideas behind capitalism, rather than just throwing money at a problem?

Mr. PAUL. I think the point the gentleman makes is well taken. But I would not advocate the people in our State Department, because I would not place a lot of confidence in them, promote the idea of capitalism.

Mr. SYMMS. Maybe some of them do not believe in it.

Mr. PAUL. But I do think that the only alternatives are the principles of freedom and the ideas of capitalism if our country is to survive or if these other nations are to survive. For us to accept their principles of government intervention and deficit financing and runaway inflation in order to save their country, we will neither be able to feed them or ourselves.

Mr. SYMMS. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman might be interested in knowing that a very thoughtful constituent of mine suggested to me the other day that the U.S. Government would achieve its goals much better if it would either send the Amway man or bomb the countries like this with Sears Roebuck catalogs instead of what they are doing with all of the foreign aid programs.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) has expired.

(On request of Mr. SYMMS and by unanimous consent, Mr. PAUL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SYMMS. This would allow for the exportation of the ideas of how it is in this country that we have been able to produce these consumer goods that people have as a fringe benefit of a free-market economy, whereas in the foreign countries it seems as though, historically—this has been going on for some 40 years—we just continue to pound tax dollars that we extract from hard-working Americans and flood overseas markets with it, but yet it never seems to gain anything. I think the gentleman is right about the fact the ideological question is often overlooked.

Mr. PAUL. I believe if we do not look at ideology, we cannot help ourselves, nor can we help them. I think the problem is one of how to persuade them to accept correct economic principles. The best way to persuade, of course, is to set an example. We are hardly doing that these days especially with legislation of this sort.

I would like to suggest also, to those who still remain among us who on occasion, read the Constitution, that there is part of the Constitution that says we must have authority to do such things as this legislation does on the House floor. I beg of my colleagues to please point out to me which part of the Constitution it is that authorizes us the moral right to extract from our working people, to inflate more in this country, to create havoc on our people, in order to subsidize other nations, whether they are right-wing dictators or left-wing dictators. I find no place in the Constitution which gives us that authority.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. SYMMS and by unanimous consent, Mr. PAUL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SYMMS. If the gentleman will yield further, I do think, as far as the virtues of this goes, the gentleman is speaking primarily just on the bill. As far as the virtues of this amendment are concerned, at least with this amendment the pro-Communist Sandinistas would get less of this money, so I assume the gentleman would not object to that idea.

Mr. PAUL. I think the temptation certainly is there, and yet it is abhorrent to me to think that I should even have the prerogative of extracting from the American people and to assume the authority to say that I know what is best



as to where their tax dollars should be spent throughout the world and to which government I should support. I certainly have a personal leaning in the direction of the intent of the proposed amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

□ 1610

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I was somewhat surprised at the vehement style in which our chairman attacked the amendment. It is slightly out of character for the gentleman.

I must say that I find the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York most logical.

First of all, in the breaking out of the figures in proportion to population, Einstein could not have done a better job. The gentleman is to be commended for his accuracy and aptitude.

The other thing I would like to point out to the Members is this bill itself. I direct the Members to the title of the bill. The bill is, and I read the title:

To amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize assistance in support of peaceful and democratic processes of development in Central America.

It does not say just in Nicaragua. It says in Central America. The other countries that the gentleman from New York would have to share in proportion to their population, Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala, are as much a part of Central America as anyone else.

I think this amendment is consistent with the thrust of the bill, if the title of the bill is what is really intended.

I had facetiously prepared an amendment to the title of the bill. I decided subsequently not to offer it, but it would have changed the title to read, "The bailout of the Nicaraguan Sandinista junta bill."

I would have been accused of playing games, being funny, injecting an irrelevant argument, but in effect if we do not accept the principle of the Gilman amendment, we are admitting that instead of a bill to produce peace and democracy in Central America, we are supporting a bill just for the Sandinista junta.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It always disturbs me when Members, in their zeal to promote one policy or another or amendment or another on the floor, read things out of context.

I know the gentleman from Illinois does not want to leave this body with the impression that that is all that is contained in section 536 of the bill.

The gentleman from Illinois has only read the first part of the first sentence. If he would read further, it would say:

The recent civil strife in Nicaragua has caused great human suffering and disruption to the economy of that country and

that substantial external assistance to Nicaragua is necessary to help alleviate that suffering and to promote economic recovery within a peaceful and democratic process.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I was reading from the title of the bill, which is about all that catches some Members' eyes.

Let me say the gentleman from New York has a practical amendment.

I gather that the forces of political loyalty and political skill on the other side of the aisle are solid against it, but I do think he deserves commendation for offering his carefully drawn amendment.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the great statesman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is absolutely on target. I think everything he has said is correct. I think we might even call the Gilman amendment the honesty amendment.

There are a number of us who might have some degree of doubt as to how much we should send to Nicaragua, but if we are going to call this particular proposal a special Central America Assistance Act, at least it should be that.

In response to what our friend from Iowa just said, the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, as recently as December 27, sent a letter to our colleagues from New York (Mr. GILMAN), in which he specifically outlined money going into Nicaragua: \$255.7 million from third-country grants and from assistance from the Inter-American Development Bank, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, United Nations High Commission for Refugees, International Monetary Fund, of which my colleague from Illinois, I know, can rapidly point out the percentage that this country puts into those funds, \$314.8 million, so they have not exactly been destitute of money coming into Nicaragua, much of which comes indirectly from the American taxpayers.

I thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding. I thank him for the forthright statement he has made. I hope we pass what I would like to call the honesty amendment by our colleague from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to our distinguished chairman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

I am just wondering if the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), when he corrects his remarks—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) has expired.

(At the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI and by unanimous consent, Mr. DERWINSKI was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman will continue to yield, in reference to the gentleman from Wisconsin's response to the amendment offered, the so-called honesty amendment—I do not know where the honesty is, because it is apples and oranges—of the gentleman from

New York, where he says I vehemently opposed the amendment. If he would substitute in lieu thereof "emphatically" opposed.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I will accept that correction.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Instead of saying that I was out of character, that I was in character, because I emphatically oppose it for very good reasons.

The gentleman from New York—and I am surprised that the gentleman from Illinois would agree with him—in saying that he had, like Einstein, figured out the mathematics of this on a population basis.

As the gentleman knows, the legislation before us, H.R. 6081, contains \$75 million for Nicaragua, with \$70 million in loans and \$5 million in grants.

The amendment of the gentleman from New York is not refined to the extent as to providing what portion should be loans and what portion can be grants.

I must question the gentleman's assessment of the wisdom, not only the wisdom, but the accuracy of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Two observations: One, my use of Einstein as a reference was intended as an ethnic compliment. Second, I am certainly not going to quarrel with the correction the gentleman from Wisconsin has suggested, because he has at his right hand the able Dr. Jack Brady, our committee staff director, thus the gentleman from Wisconsin always has an advantage.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman will continue to yield, having so often recognized the wisdom and ability of Dr. Brady, I wonder why the gentleman from Illinois does not sometimes take advantage of his suggestions?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would like to, and I appreciate the suggestion.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to correct one misimpression. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) did engage in some uncharacteristic hyperbole when he talked about the Gilman amendment. I, too, was surprised. He is the kind of gentleman who likes to sit quietly and share a good story, draw on his pipe and perhaps late in the evening have a libation to relax after a hard day. This will be one of those days, I am sure.

I was surprised at the vehemence of the attack on the gentleman from New York, who many times has agreed with the gentleman from Wisconsin—perhaps no more after this—but many times in the past has agreed with him.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield, yes, in the same spirit.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I might apologize if I appeared too straightforward in my criticism, because I expected more of the gentleman from New York, as a member of the committee—

Mr. BAUMAN. \$75 million is quite a bit, is that not enough?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No. I mean more as far as accuracy in the amendment he would prepare.

Mr. BAUMAN. I see.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Or that he would propose. Therefore, perhaps my impatience with him and expecting more from him has caused me to be a little overly critical. I apologize for it, but after the hours and after a little libation, I will mellow again.

Mr. BAUMAN. Well, I appreciate the gentleman's correction and the apology. I do not think it was really necessary. There are some Members obviously one expects more of and others that one does not. I know the gentleman never castigated me in the same manner that he castigated the gentleman from New York, since the gentleman does not perhaps expect as much.

□ 1620

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Maryland yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. Of course. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I have never had the need to, because the gentleman has always been at his optimum.

Mr. BAUMAN. Always been at his optimum?

Well, now, I will now attempt to reach the optimum of the gentleman, if I may.

First of all, let me say to the chairman of the committee that there was no double accounting in these figures. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) is quite right that if we pass this bill and if we approve the additional request now pending for the next fiscal year, the U.S. taxpayers will have given, loaned, or granted—since we know the terms of the loan we might as well say granted—almost \$200 million to the Government of Nicaragua.

Now, what does the gentleman from New York suggest? Simply that there should be a more even distribution of the \$80 million in this bill.

Well, let me let you in on a little secret, those of you who do not serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee or do not pay particularly close attention to what they do. The Carter administration policy plainly described is to overthrow a number of governments in Central and South America. Now, that is a rather harsh charge, is it not? But I am here to tell you that the policy of the Carter administration is to overthrow a number of governments in Central America. They started with Nicaragua. They cut off all U.S. aid to Somoza that they could. They put an embargo on all weapons shipments. They put an embargo on loans. They used their influence in the international lending institutions to topple Somoza, and they toppled him.

Now, what they have got is the Communist government that we are dealing with today; so free Nicaragua has been overthrown.

Now, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Bushnell, spoke last fall in Caracas and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) was there. In remarks before that gathering in Caracas, Bushnell came out and told the other delegates to that conference that it would be the policy of the Carter administration to see several governments toppled in Central

America, some of which he characterized as already too far gone to save.

I quote from a January 27, 1980, dispatch from the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, William Bowdler, in Managua, who was commenting on the character of the government there;

Ambassador Bowdler, who actively participated in finding a solution to the Nicaraguan political crisis solved six months ago with the installation of the Sandinista Government, also said in Managua that he hopes there will be a similar solution for El Salvador.

Poor little El Salvador, right here on the map. That is the next one on the Carter list to go.

Yesterday the Ambassador designate to El Salvador, Mr. White, who has not been confirmed by the other body, said flatly:

We are going to cut their aid off. We don't like the direction they are going and we are going to cut them off.

Slated after that are Honduras and Guatemala. You see, we in the United States who are not supposed to impose free elections on Nicaragua, our own Government, the Carter administration, is systematically trying to topple one government after another in hopes that they will be replaced by more democratic, more liberal and more free governments. Some would give them credit for their motivations. Unfortunately, in the first case of Nicaragua, the country has already fallen to the Communists. In other cases similar events may occur. So when the gentleman from New York suggests that we spread this aid around to other governments in the Central American area, the gentleman is saying, "Let's go through constitutionally established means if you're going to change these governments and let's send an even-handed signal." If we are going to give aid to what we believe is a Communist dominated government in one country, let us give aid to the other countries who yet remain free.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Maryland for his statement. I think that there has been action, whether it was deliberate, thought out or not, and I think there are those who did think it out; we have taken action in this administration, in this Government, that has destabilized certain governments. Now, you can argue whether that is a good idea or not, but I think that no one can argue with the idea that if you are going to destabilize a government, if you are going to help in ousting a government, you ought to have a better substitute than the one that was already there.

I have certainly seen nothing that indicates that in Nicaragua that is the case.

You know, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras have been long-time allies of the United States. Recently, just by way of one example, they demonstrated

that friendship by supporting the United States position at the United Nations with regard to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Unlike the other countries of Central America, Nicaragua did not support the United States position at the United Nations regarding the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

The Washington Star on February 18 reported that U.S. specialists on Latin America have credited Cuba with playing a key organizing role in the Sandinista victories in Nicaragua last July and now are in moves toward consolidating Communist power there.

In fact, one U.S. specialist stated that the infrastructure for a complete Communist takeover is now being put into place in Nicaragua.

If H.R. 6081 is adopted without the Gilman amendment, the wrong signal will be sent to our friends and to our enemies throughout the world.

We have all heard already what assistance we have provided to Nicaragua as of this date, some \$70 million up to this point, plus large amounts indirectly through international organizations. If we do not change this bill, as proposed by the Gilman amendment, the message is going to be to the world that the United States is willing to assist Marxist revolutionaries who come to power by the use of the gun, but we are not willing to assist countries at least to the same degree who are pro-United States and who are fighting for their very survival.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks. I think they put the Gilman amendment in a great deal of perspective for us.

I, too, found the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland very enlightening, as well as the gentleman from California, with respect to the administration's position toward aiding the overthrow of governments that are now in power. It seems rather ironic to me that the same administration is willing to stand up and say that they are willing to test the Russians in Iran, 12,000 miles from home, if they should happen to cross the border from Afghanistan into Iran; yet are unwilling to stand up and resist the same Marxist expansionism in Latin America, closer to home. It does not make too much sense.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's bewilderment at the administration's policy in this matter.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the debate. I am not on the Foreign Affairs Committee, as several of the Members who have spoken are also not on the committee; but what I find very difficult to comprehend is hearing the gentleman from Maryland and the gentleman from California set forth this administration's policy. They have stated very clearly that this is the policy of the administration,



which is to overthrow these governments, to interfere in such a way that we are basically as a governmental plan helpfully setting up Communist governments. I do not believe it is the intention of this administration to meddle in such a way as to create and overthrow existing governments and create Communist governments. I think at least it ought to be said for the record that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are not speaking for the administration and are speaking in their opinion of what may be happening. That opinion, I think, is subject to some very sharp differences.

If nothing more, Mr. Chairman, I think the point should be established that the opinions that have been offered on the other side at the best are opinions that would have some very strong questions raised on them.

I think we simply should move ahead and let each side present their point of view; but, please, do not speak for the administration and do not infer that the American Government is involved in establishing Communist regimes in other countries.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 138, noes 258, answered "present" 2, not voting 35, as follows:

## [Roll No. 80]

## AYES—138

Abdnor	Grassley	Myers, Ind.
Andrews,	Grisham	Nichols
N. Dak.	Guyer	O'Brien
Applegate	Hammer-	Quayle
Archer	schmidt	Quillen
Ashbrook	Hansen	Regula
Atkinson	Harsha	Robinson
Badham	Heckler	Roth
Bafalis	Hillis	Rudd
Bauman	Hinson	Runnels
Beard, Tenn.	Holt	Satterfield
Bethune	Hopkins	Sawyer
Bouquard	Huckaby	Schulze
Broomfield	Ichord	Sebelius
Brown, Ohio	Ireland	Sensenbrenner
Broyhill	Jeffries	Shelby
Burgener	Johnson, Colo.	Shumway
Butler	Kelly	Shuster
Byron	Kemp	Smith, Nebr.
Campbell	Kindness	Snowe
Carney	Kramer	Snyder
Carter	Lagomarsino	Solomon
Clausen	Leath, Tex.	Spence
Coleman	Lee	Staggers
Collins, Tex.	Lent	Stangeland
Conable	Lewis	Stockman
Corcoran	Livingston	Stratton
Coughlin	Loeffler	Stump
Crane, Daniel	Lott	Symms
Daniel, R. W.	Lujan	Tauke
Dannemeyer	Lunnen	Taylor
Davis, Mich.	McClary	Thomas
Derwinski	McDonald	Trible
Dickinson	McEwen	Walker
Duncan, Tenn.	Madigan	Wampler
Early	Marks	White
Erlenborn	Marlenee	Whitehurst
Evans, Del.	Martin	Whittaker
Findley	Mathis	Whitten
Forsythe	Michel	Wilson, Bob
Gaydos	Miller, Ohio	Winn
Gilman	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wyatt
Gingrich	Montgomery	Wydler
Goldwater	Moorhead,	Wylie
Goodling	Calif.	Young, Alaska
Gradison	Mottl	Young, Fla.
Gramm	Murphy, N.Y.	Zefiretti

## NOES—258

Addabbo	Fuqua	Nowak
Akaka	Garcia	Oakar
Albosta	Gephardt	Oberstar
Alexander	Gibbons	Obey
Ambro	Ginn	Ottinger
Anderson,	Glickman	Panetta
Calif.	Gonzalez	Pashayan
Andrews, N.C.	Gore	Patten
Annunzio	Gray	Patterson
Anthony	Green	Pease
Ashley	Guarini	Pepper
Aspin	Gudger	Perkins
AuCoin	Hall, Tex.	Petri
Bailey	Hamilton	Peyser
Baldus	Hance	Pickle
Barnes	Hanley	Porter
Bedell	Harkin	Preyer
Bellenson	Harris	Price
Benjamin	Hefner	Pritchard
Bennett	Heftel	Pursell
Bereuter	Hightower	Rahall
Bevill	Holland	Rallsback
Bingham	Hollenbeck	Rangel
Blanchard	Holtzman	Reuss
Boland	Horton	Rhodes
Bolling	Howard	Richmond
Bonior	Hubbard	Rinaldo
Bonker	Hughes	Ritter
Bowen	Hutto	Roberts
Brademas	Hyde	Rodino
Breaux	Jacobs	Roe
Brinkley	Jeffords	Rose
Brodhead	Jenkins	Rosenthal
Brooks	Jenrette	Rostenkowski
Buchanan	Johnson, Calif.	Roybal
Burlison	Jones, N.C.	Royer
Burton, John	Jones, Okla.	Russo
Burton, Phillip	Jones, Tenn.	Sabo
Carr	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Cavanaugh	Kazen	Schroeder
Chappell	Kildee	Seiberling
Cheney	Kogovsek	Shannon
Clay	Kostmayer	Sharp
Clinger	LaFalce	Simon
Coelho	Latta	Skelton
Collins, Ill.	Leach, Iowa	Slack
Conte	Leach, La.	Smith, Iowa
Corman	Lederer	Solarz
Cotter	Lehman	Spellman
Courter	Leland	St Germain
Danielson	Levitas	Stack
de la Garza	Lloyd	Stanton
Deckard	Long, La.	Stark
Dellums	Long, Md.	Steed
Derrick	Lowry	Stenholm
Dicks	Luken	Stewart
Diggs	Lundine	Stokes
Dingell	McCormack	Studds
Dodd	McDade	Swift
Donnelly	McHugh	Synar
Dougherty	McKay	Thompson
Downey	McKinney	Traxler
Drinan	Maguire	Udall
Eckhardt	Markey	Ullman
Edgar	Marriott	Van Deerlin
Edwards, Calif.	Matsui	Vento
Emery	Mattox	Volkmer
English	Mavroules	Walgren
Erdahl	Mazzoli	Watkins
Ertel	Mica	Waxman
Evans, Ga.	Mikulski	Weaver
Evans, Ind.	Miller, Calif.	Weiss
Fary	Mineta	Whitley
Fascell	Minish	Williams, Mont.
Fazio	Mitchell, Md.	Williams, Ohio
Fenwick	Moakley	Wilson, C. H.
Ferraro	Moffett	Wilson, Tex.
Fish	Mollohan	Wirth
Fisher	Moorhead, Pa.	Wolfe
Fithian	Murphy, Pa.	Wolpe
Filippo	Murtha	Wright
Florio	Myers, Pa.	Yates
Foley	Natcher	Yatron
Ford, Mich.	Neal	Young, Mo.
Ford, Tenn.	Nedzi	Zablocki
Fountain	Nelson	
Fowler	Nolan	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Daniel, Dan Paul

## NOT VOTING—35

Anderson, Ill.	Daschle	Hall, Ohio
Barnard	Davis, S.C.	Hawkins
Beard, R.I.	Devine	McCloskey
Biaggi	Dixon	Moore
Boggs	Dornan	Murphy, Ill.
Boner	Duncan, Oreg.	Ratchford
Brown, Calif.	Edwards, Ala.	Rousselot
Chisholm	Edwards, Okla.	Santini
Cleveland	Frenzel	Treen
Conyers	Frost	Vander Jagt
Crane, Philip	Giulmo	Vanik
D'Amours	Hagedorn	

## □ 1640

Mr. HALL changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: Page 4, line 18, immediately after "(1)" insert (1); and immediately after line 24 insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) Of the local currency referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection used for assistance to the private sector, 10 per centum of such sums shall be used to assist the establishment of such private institutions as credit unions, cooperatives, and other lending facilities to help keep the private sector financially independent. The remaining 90 per centum of such amounts of local currency shall be made available for loans through such private institutions so established, through other such private institutions which remain independent of the Nicaraguan Government, or through available facilities of United States financial institutions: Provided that such local currency loan programs shall be monitored and audited by such agency or official of the United States as the President deems appropriate, and the President shall submit quarterly reports on such loan programs to the Congress."

## □ 1650

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, both the administration and the officials of the Sandinista National Directorate who met with many of us on December 6, 1979, have stressed the importance of rebuilding and invigorating the private sector in Nicaragua. They have pointed to that goal as the main purpose of the \$70 million balance of payments loan program component of the proposed aid package to Nicaragua.

The administration has indicated that 60 percent of the foreign exchange loan and about 64 percent of the local currency fund are for private sector use. The spokesman for the delegation of the Sandinista regime who met with us, Cmdr. Jaime Wheelock, increased the percentage which he said would go to the private sector to 80 percent.

The purpose of this amendment is to help realize the stated purpose of the bill—to strengthen the private sector in Nicaragua. It would assist in establishing private institutions, such as credit unions and cooperatives, to maintain the financial independence of the private sector. It would mitigate against the political misuse of U.S. aid and money in Nicaragua. Without special care a political motive central agency could easily reward its friends and punish its enemies. If our goal is to cultivate pluralism and private initiatives, this provision would contribute to that end.

The amendment would also provide for Presidential review of the distribution of the local currency generated by the U.S. loan to assure that it is made available to the entities we want to help.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that in the same conversation that I mentioned some minutes ago with Mr. Cruz, the head of the Central Bank which, as I understand it, will be the administering agency for this money unless the gentleman's amendment is passed, he indicated that he personally did not object to an amendment to this bill that would make sure the 60 percent that has been said to be for the private sector will go to that private sector. The difficulty that we have in Nicaragua is that the government has in fact nationalized the private banks. They did so, he told me, for administrative reasons. This amendment would encourage the private sector that we say we are trying to help, the so-called backbone of the freedom-loving peoples of Nicaragua as opposed to those who might be for a totalitarian government and would distribute the aid toward that end.

Mr. Chairman, I can say in the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois there is a mechanism to guarantee what the Carter administration says they want to guarantee and that is that the money will go into private hands to build up the private economy and individual businessmen and farmers.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, may I make a personal comment. Aside from the merits of my amendment, I hope all the Members of this body will notice the profound manner in which the gentleman from Maryland addresses foreign policy issues.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I dislike opposing the gentleman's amendment, but I have some questions about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(At the request of Mr. HARKIN and by unanimous consent, Mr. DERWINSKI was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARKIN. Will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. The gentleman asked that 10 percent of the money be used to establish such private institutions as credit unions, cooperatives, et cetera. Can the gentleman tell me how many credit unions and cooperatives and lending facilities were in existence in Nicaragua prior to last July, prior to the overthrow of the Somoza government?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I have no specific number. I do know as a policy our credit union movement has attempted to establish itself throughout Latin America. I do not know what success they have had in Nicaragua.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, since we are talking about a country that needs immediate assistance because of the nature of the war that took place there, can the gentleman tell me how long it would take to set up credit unions,

cooperatives and lending facilities to get the other 90 percent of the money through there? It seems to me it would take a long period of time.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I envision that the other 90 percent would be channeled through U.S. financial institutions which could be contracted for immediately by the AID agency, if they do not happen to have the Technical expertise.

Mr. HARKIN. However, the amendment says that the other 90 percent shall be made available for loans through such private institutions so established.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I am saying it may take a long time to set up those kinds of institutions, which may defeat the whole purpose of the AID.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Actually all you need technically is to charter one entity. The cooperative farm movement does exist. In a general way they did handle many of their crops through a cooperative movement and I am sure the gentleman, expert as he is in the Iowa farm sector, knows how practical and expedient farm cooperatives can be.

Mr. HARKIN. If the gentleman would yield further, Mr. Chairman, I do know that the cooperative movement in Nicaragua was never allowed to get on its feet. Only now is it beginning to be formed down there in rural areas.

Mr. Chairman, I am very supportive of that movement down there but it is in embryonic stages and in no way could they handle this kind of money to disperse amongst the members. It would just take a long period of time.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Given the need and given the desire evidently of the government to absorb these funds it could be done.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and will speak in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall try to be as moderate and as calm as possible in my opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

The gentleman as well as the gentleman from New York are very distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I must nevertheless register my surprise that such an amendment would be offered, since the gentleman from Illinois does know that a major purpose and objective of the \$75 million in this legislation is to stimulate the private sector of the economy of Nicaragua as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Chairman, private financial institutions just do not exist which could manage the credit to be channeled to the thousands of small and medium enterprises and farms. Creation of such a system would take years, as the gentleman from Iowa has pointed out, and the assistance is needed immediately.

Mr. Chairman, the Agency for International Development is currently providing assistance to the Nicaraguan credit union confederation and to the private cooperative federation. How-

ever, these institutions have limited absorptive capacity and have never before been used to conduct the entire aid program.

Mr. Chairman, local currency programs as envisioned in this bill will be governed by detailed sub-agreements which will assure monitoring and audit rights to the United States, which will be a signatory to the agreement.

□ 1700

Now, if we would go the route suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, we would lose that audit possibility and the audit responsibility. I want to point out further that the gentleman's amendment also requires that the President shall submit quarterly reports on such loan programs to the Congress. H.R. 6081, as the gentleman from Illinois fully well knows, already requires a semiannual report to the President, so much of the amendment is already in the legislation and some of the innovative suggestions are unworkable.

I must repeat that there are no private financial institutions in Nicaragua which can handle an aid program, so the amendment essentially would prohibit aid. Now, I must respectfully say to my colleagues who have thus far opposed this legislation, if they are opposed to it, vote against it; do not do it by crippling amendments, indirectly killing the intent of the legislation.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I will be delighted to yield to my friend the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is certainly not intended as a crippling amendment. It is intended to stimulate the rebirth of private institutions, and a more noble goal I could not envision.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Well, the gentleman sees it in a different light, obviously. But I must note that the gentleman in his past service in the Congress has sought very intensively to insure that we have proper oversight and that we have auditing of our programs by AID in all of the recipient countries. Auditing would be more difficult if the aid is dispersed to many private concerns than through a government agency which we can hold responsible. When we deal with a single agency we can hold them more effectively also to repayments, which I am sure the gentleman would be interested in, and better insure that loans would be halted in the case of noncompliance.

I submit that the gentleman's amendment would make this very difficult. How can we carry out a multipurpose aid program through credit unions that do not at the present time exist? I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for the fine explanation of why this is not a feasible amendment. For those who are concerned that the Central Bank or National Bank of Nicaragua will not be fair with the dispensing of



the loans and the administration of such, I think it is fair to point out, and I think the chairman will agree with me, the head of the Central Bank, Arturo Cruz, who has been characterized by the gentleman from Maryland about an hour ago as a moderate in the government, who has wide financial knowledge and who has worked for an international financial lending institution before coming to Nicaragua, and is working in the Central Bank, we can be assured, I think, of his administrative skill and fairness in dispensing the money.

Second, I think the chairman would agree that the concern of the private sector, which is I think Nicaragua's most prestigious financial element, has the full faith behind the government's economic plan and will work in concessions and loans, will work for the betterment of the market in the private sector.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this amendment is really perhaps the most important amendment that we will consider this afternoon or during the course of the discussion of this legislation. Both the administration and the officials of the Sandinista National Directorate that we met with here in Washington and also in Nicaragua have stressed the importance of rebuilding and invigorating the private sector in Nicaragua. Indeed, that is said to be one of the main purposes of the bill.

They have pointed to that goal, as I say, as the main purpose of the \$70 billion balance of payment loan program component of the proposed aid package to Nicaragua.

The administration has indicated, and the legislation before us requires that 60 percent of the foreign exchange go for private sector use. The spokesman for the delegation of the Sandinista's regime who met with us, Comdr. Jamie Wheelock, told us that in fact he was going to provide 80 percent to the private sector.

The purpose of this amendment, the amendment offered by my friend from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), is to help realize the stated purpose of the bill, to strengthen the private sector of Nicaragua. It would assist in establishing private institutions such as credit unions and cooperatives. By the way, there are farm cooperatives in Nicaragua, and as a matter of fact, the Government makes a big point out of how it is working with these farm cooperatives; that is, to maintain the financial independence of the private sector. It would mitigate against—perhaps not prevent, but mitigate—against the political misuse of U.S. aid and money in that country. Without special care a politically motivated central agency such as the Central Bank could easily reward its friends and punish its enemies. If our goal is to cultivate pluralism and private initiative, this provision would contribute to that end.

The amendment would also provide for Presidential review of the distribution of local currency generated by the United States loan to assure that it is made available to the entities we want to help.

I would just add that I should think no one would doubt that whoever is in charge of the Central Bank of Nicaragua, Mr. Arturo Cruz or anyone else, no one should doubt that he is going to do exactly what he is told to do by the National Directorate of the Sandinistas, so I think this is a very essential amendment and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, for clarification I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a few questions. According to the report on page 5, it says that \$30 million in credit will be given to small- and medium-sized business and to farmers principally for working capital. Now, what are the mechanics? Does this money go in the form of a grant or in the form of a loan to Nicaragua?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In the legislation before us there is \$5 million that is grant and \$70 million that is loans. A portion of that will be for the purposes that the gentleman has referred to in our report on page 5, for medium-sized businesses and farms. There will be some for educational purposes as well.

The \$30 million that is referred to on page 5 would be in loans to small and medium-sized businesses and farms. The implementation would be made through the Central Bank of Nicaragua. The United States AID mission, however, would have to oversee and sign off on every loan, and we would also have an audit of the loans made.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will it be a loan from the United States to that bank?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It will be a loan to the Bank of Nicaragua, to be loaned out under the supervision of the Embassy.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. What increase rate will there be?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It will be a concessional loan, with an interest rate of 2-3 percent. As I said the other day, there would be up to 40 years' repayment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am not objecting to that, but I want to point out something a little later. Will the Foreign Assistance Fund then pay to the Treasury of the United States the money that is collected from the loan, and if so, at what rate of interest?

□ 1710

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Well, Mr. Chairman, any interest earned will go back into the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The exact amount that is earned, is that right?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that the Office of Management and Budget and some members of the Committee on the Budget of the House and of the Senate Committee on the Budget are insisting that in the case of small business loans in this country for people who are in the same kind of situation, needing some working capital, they insist the Small Business Administration loan fund

should pay to our Treasury not just the amount they receive in interest on the loan but 10½ percent per year from then on and, in addition to that, pay interest on the interest that is appropriated annually with which to pay the "interest" on the money previously appropriated.

What I am pointing out here is that some people have kind of a double standard. If it is to be made to people in this country for the same purpose as money in this bill, then OMB and some Budget Committee members want to sock the SBA loan fund permanently with all kinds of excess interest charges; yet they support this different approach for these loans to businesses in a foreign country.

Mr. Chairman, the way you handle it in this bill makes more sense to me, but it is a double standard.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Of course, the situation is, as far as the loan to Nicaragua is concerned, that the loan is needed to correct a bad economic situation. Let me assure the gentleman that if he would attempt to correct the OMB position, I will join him in that effort.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I say that the gentleman has already voted for the way we feel on this. We have some trouble with the bill that is now in conference because OMB and some Members of the Senate are opposing handling loans for U.S. businesses in trouble the same way this bill does for foreigners. But I want to point this out, that we have a double standard here between the OMB supporting this bill and some members of the Committee on the Budget of the House and the Budget Committee of the Senate supporting a different standard.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) and others know so much about the manner in which these loans will be administered once they get to Nicaragua, because when I was there 2 weeks ago, it was still under negotiation as to how they would be distributed. I talked with the U.S. Embassy aid officials and was told there are some disputes in the Sandinista government as to whether this money would go to medium-sized businesses, to small businesses and small farms only, or to medium-sized farms. There was some dispute whether it would go to cooperatives. At that point no final determination had been made.

There was no question, however, when they described the situation to me, that the money would be handled by the Central Bank. The reason, we were told, is that there are no other institutions left because the Government of Nicaragua nationalized all the banks, wiped them out, so there are no private banks to administer it. It is not beyond the realm of possibility, if this language is put into the act, that private banking can be revived. There are buildings and there are accounts but the private banks have been forbidden to engage in banking.

I want to correct one other misimpression of the gentleman from Wisconsin, I am sure, gave unintentionally. He said

the amendment would gut the bill and prevent proper administration of the loans. All the amendment says is that 10 percent of the funds will be distributed and used "to assist the establishment of such private institutions as credit unions, cooperatives, and other lending facilities \* \* \*."

There are lending facilities that could be reactivated, and the cooperatives are already in place.

The amendment goes on to say that the remaining 90 percent can be distributed through private firms, partially held American banking institutions, or they could be distributed through agencies of the Government of Nicaragua.

Mr. Chairman, this does not in any way present a problem, but it does guarantee the Nicaraguan private sector will have the assistance we supposedly are giving to it.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) just innocently used that term, "gutting," because he knows that down deep in my heart what I want to do is salvage a bad policy by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I point out one other thing. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) added a dimension to this debate. My recollection is that this money that we are providing will be repaid by the Government of Nicaragua at the rate of 2 percent. However, the charges to the recipient in Nicaragua will be at whatever the market rate is in that country, which is probably higher than the prime rate here. The Government of Nicaragua could well find itself with a 13-15 percent profit with repayment to the United States at a 2-percent rate.

That is a very interesting point that the Members should keep in mind when the going rate to our own mortgage borrowers and to people seeking financing from their local banks is not anywhere near that 2-percent figure.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would just plead for the adoption of this amendment if we are indeed sincere about wanting to promote the private sector, because I have no doubt that if the decision on who will get the loans and the grants is left totally to the Sandinista government, they will go only to their friends and certainly not to anyone who might cause them the least bit of opposition.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, just to be sure I understand the purpose of the gentleman's amendment correctly, is what we are saying here that this amendment, if it is passed and becomes part of this bill, would provide this: that we would have actually Americans down there distributing American aid instead of allowing the Sandinistas to distribute American aid?

Mr. BAUMAN. Not necessarily. We are saying that banking institutions that have existed in the private sector in the past, some of them probably owned in part by U.S. citizens, would distribute those loans through the due course of the banking system rather than allowing a government agency of the Sandinistas to make that distribution.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that that is a very reasonable approach and the proper way to do it. If we are going to send our money down there, we should at least try to have it done in such a way that we would not have Communists using American money to subvert the minorities.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, reasonableness is not always the test, as the gentleman knows, in this House.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

I merely wish to respond to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) who stated that the gentleman from Wisconsin apparently had some information—and he did not—as to how the loans would be administered.

If the gentleman will recall, at a meeting we had last Friday, this matter was discussed, and although we were advised that the details are still being worked out, they are not finalized, but for illustrative purposes the gentleman from Wisconsin did repeat what he has been advised by our Ambassador to Nicaragua, Mr. Pezzullo.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would just comment on the statement of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), when he said he was advising the gentleman from Wisconsin that I should know that down deep in his heart he is trying to salvage the bill. I would like to respond that down deep in my heart I wish that were true.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 199, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

AYES—195

Abdnor	Bennett	Carter
Addabbo	Bereuter	Chappell
Albosta	Bethune	Clausen
Anderson,	Bouquard	Coleman
Calif.	Breaux	Collins, Tex.
Andrews,	Brinkley	Conable
N. Dak.	Broomfield	Conte
Applegate	Brown, Ohio	Corcoran
Archer	Brownhill	Coughlin
Ashbrook	Buchanan	Courter
Atkinson	Burgener	Crane, Daniel
Badham	Butler	Daniel, Dan
Bafalis	Byron	Daniel, R. W.
Bauman	Campbell	Dannemeyer
Beard, Tenn.	Carney	Davis, Mich.

de la Garza  
Deckard  
Derwinski  
Dickinson  
Duncan, Tenn.  
Early  
Emery  
Erdahl  
Erlenborn  
Evans, Del.  
Evans, Ga.  
Evans, Ind.  
Findley  
Fish  
Filippo  
Forsythe  
Fountain  
Fuqua  
Gaydos  
Gillman  
Gingrich  
Ginn  
Glickman  
Goldwater  
Goodling  
Gradison  
Gramm  
Grassley  
Green  
Grisham  
Gudger  
Guyer  
Hall, Tex.  
Hammer-  
schmidt  
Hance  
Hansen  
Harsha  
Heckler  
Heftel  
Hillis  
Hinson  
Holland  
Holt  
Hopkins  
Horton  
Huckaby  
Hyde  
Ichord  
Ireland  
Jeffries  
Jenkins

Johnson, Colo.  
Jones, N.C.  
Kazen  
Kelly  
Kemp  
Kindness  
Kramer  
Lagomarsino  
Latta  
Leach, Iowa  
Leath, Tex.  
Lee  
Lent  
Lewis  
Livingston  
Loeffler  
Long, Md.  
Lott  
Lujan  
Lungren  
McClory  
McDonald  
McEwen  
McKay  
Madigan  
Marks  
Marlenee  
Marriott  
Martin  
Mathis  
Mazzoli  
Michel  
Miller, Ohio  
Minish  
Mitchell, N.Y.  
Montgomery  
Moorhead,  
Calif.  
Mottl  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Myers, Ind.  
Natcher  
Nichols  
O'Brien  
Panetta  
Pashayan  
Paul  
Petri  
Pickle  
Porter  
Purcell  
Quayle

#### NOES—199

Akaka	Edwards, Calif.	Levitas
Ambro	English	Lloyd
Andrews, N.C.	Ertel	Long, La.
Annunzio	Fary	Lowry
Anthony	Fascell	Luken
Ashley	Fazio	Lundine
Aspin	Fenwick	McCormack
AuCoin	Ferraro	McDade
Bailey	Fisher	McHugh
Baldus	Fithian	McKinney
Barnard	Florio	Maguire
Barnes	Foley	Markey
Beard, R.I.	Ford, Mich.	Matsui
Bedeil	Ford, Tenn.	Mattox
Bellenson	Fowler	Mavroules
Benjamin	Garcia	Mica
Bevill	Gephardt	Mikulski
Bingham	Gibbons	Miller, Calif.
Blanchard	Gonzalez	Mineta
Boland	Gore	Mitchell, Md.
Bolling	Gray	Moakley
Bonior	Guarini	Moffett
Bonker	Hall, Ohio	Mollohan
Bowen	Hamilton	Moorhead, Pa.
Brademas	Hanley	Murphy, Pa.
Brodhead	Harkin	Murtha
Brooks	Harris	Myers, Pa.
Brown, Calif.	Hawkins	Neal
Burlison	Hefner	Nedzi
Burton, John	Hightower	Nelson
Burton, Phillip	Hollenbeck	Nolan
Carr	Holtzman	Nowak
Cavanaugh	Howard	Oakar
Cheney	Hubbard	Oberstar
Clay	Hughes	Obey
Clinger	Hutto	Ottinger
Coelho	Jacobs	Patten
Collins, Ill.	Jeffords	Patterson
Corman	Jenrette	Pease
Cotter	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper
Danielson	Jones, Okla.	Perkins
Daschle	Jones, Tenn.	Peyser
Dellums	Kastenmeier	Preyer
Dicks	Kildee	Price
Dingell	Kogovsek	Pritchard
Dodd	Kostmayer	Rahall
Donnelly	LaFalce	Rangel
Dougherty	Leach, La.	Reuss
Downey	Lederer	Richmond
Drinan	Lehman	Roberts
Edgar	Leland	Rodino



Rose	St Germain	Watkins
Rosenthal	Stack	Weaver
Rostenkowski	Stanton	Weiss
Roybal	Stark	Whitley
Russo	Stewart	Williams, Mont.
Sabo	Stokes	Wilson, Tex.
Scheuer	Studds	Winn
Schroeder	Swift	Wirth
Seiberling	Synar	Wolfe
Shannon	Thompson	Wright
Sharp	Udall	Yates
Simon	Ullman	Young, Mo.
Skelton	Van Deerin	Zablocki
Smith, Iowa	Vento	
Solarz	Volkmer	
Spellman	Walgren	

## NOT VOTING—39

Alexander	Diggs	Murphy, Ill.
Anderson, Ill.	Dixon	Ratchford
Biaggi	Dornan	Rousselot
Boggs	Duncan, Oreg.	Santini
Boner	Eckhardt	Staggers
Chisholm	Edwards, Ala.	Steed
Cleveland	Edwards, Okla.	Treen
Conyers	Frenzel	Vander Jagt
Crane, Philip	Frost	Vanik
D'Amours	Glaime	Waxman
Davis, S.C.	Hagedorn	Wilson, Bob
Derrick	McCloskey	Wilson, C. H.
Devine	Moore	Young, Alaska

□ 1720

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dornan for, with Mr. Biaggi against.  
 Mr. Devine for, with Mrs. Boggs against.  
 Mr. Philip M. Crane for, with Mr. Conyers against.  
 Mr. Hagedorn for, with Mr. Diggs against.  
 Mr. Moore for, with Mr. Staggers against.  
 Mr. Rousselot for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.  
 Mr. Vander Jagt for, with Mr. Waxman against.  
 Mr. Young of Alaska for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California against.

Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LENT

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LENT: Page 5, immediately after line 8 insert the following new subsection:

"(k) (1) Within 30 days after the date of enactment of this provision, the President shall refer to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States any claims submitted to him, before the expiration of that 30 day period, arising from any actions described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of Section 620(e) (1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, taken by the Government of Nicaragua, or its agencies or instrumentalities.

"(2) Within 90 days after the date of referral of such claims, the Commission shall render an advisory report to the President regarding the validity and value of such claims.

"If the Government of Nicaragua has not discharged its obligations under international law to compensate such claimants or otherwise provide appropriate relief within 90 days after the Commission renders its advisory report to the President, the outstanding balance of any loans to the Government of Nicaragua, or any of its agencies or instrumentalities, of funds authorized to be appropriated under this chapter shall become immediately due and payable.

"The provisions of this subsection shall not be waived with respect to Nicaragua unless the President determines and certifies that such a waiver is important to the national interests of the United States. Such

certification shall be reported immediately to Congress."

Mr. LENT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, in our headlong rush to foist this additional \$75 million upon the new Government in Nicaragua, let us not completely overlook the thousands of American investors, farmers, miners, bankers, shareholders, businessmen, businesswomen who have suffered or are about to suffer the loss running into the hundreds of millions of dollars as a result of the expropriation of their properties by the Sandinista junta.

This amendment simply seeks to afford some measure of protection to these American citizens and corporations by establishing a mechanism for the filing of claims with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission where private property has been seized or where existing contracts or agreements have been nullified by this new government. The amendment provides that if the Government of Nicaragua fails to discharge any obligation found by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to be legitimate and valid within 90 days after the Commission renders an advisory opinion to the President to such effect, then the outstanding balance of any loan to the Government of Nicaragua or any of its agencies or instrumentalities shall immediately become due and payable.

It is a simple, straightforward amendment. It will not block the \$75 million from being delivered over to the junta. It would not tie anyone's hands in any way. As a matter of fact, under the terms of this amendment the President could waive these loan requirements on national interest grounds.

All it says is that if Nicaragua fails to act in a responsible manner, and in a manner befitting a member of the world community by recognizing its responsibilities to compensate victims of its acts of appropriation or at least American victims of its acts of appropriation and to demonstrate respect for the private sector of the economy, then and in that event its loans to the United States will immediately accelerate and become due and payable.

I think that this amendment is the very least we can do for American interests in Nicaragua that have been taken over by this new government, and I urge adoption of the amendment.

□ 1740

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENT. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wonder if the gentleman in the well could advise us as to how the gentleman's amendment differs from the Hick-

enlooper amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act.

Mr. LENT. Well, the Hickenlooper amendment in the Foreign Assistance Act provides that the President should suspend assistance to governments which behave in this manner; however, the Hickenlooper amendment, in my opinion, gives the President a little too much leeway. In the first place, it does not require, as this amendment does, that the President refer claims to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission for evaluation.

Second, there is no adequate followup under existing law to determine Presidential inaction on advisory opinions from the Commission. So far as I am aware, I do not know of one, and perhaps the gentleman can correct me, I do not know of one American investor who has ever received compensation under the Hickenlooper amendment.

This amendment, on the other hand, would insure that all American citizens' claims against the Nicaraguan Government are considered by requiring that all claims received by the President be referred to the Commission for consideration and for an advisory opinion. There are time frames provided for in this amendment similar to that provided in the Hickenlooper amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LENT. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HARKIN. The Hickenlooper amendment seems to be much more clear cut than the gentleman's amendment. The Hickenlooper amendment requires that the President terminate aid at the instant that any country expropriates American property without just compensation. It seems to me that the Hickenlooper amendment is much more clearly defined than the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. LENT. The trouble with the Hickenlooper amendment is that it operates prospectively, it operates in the future. We all know as soon as this bill is passed and signed by the President, that \$75 million is going to be delivered up very quickly; so what we are concerned about here, what we are trying to do here, we know the loan is going to be made as soon as it is passed by the House and signed by the President; but what this bill does that the Hickenlooper amendment does not do is it would have the effect of accelerating that loan. The due date of that loan will be due immediately if the Commission so advises.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for just one moment?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Several Members have come by and asked how long we will remain in the Committee. I wish to advise that we will rise at 6 or at the conclusion of this amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, because I am quite familiar with the operations of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. This amendment, while well motivated, does proceed on the basis of a total misapprehension of what the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is capable of doing. This amendment would give the Commission a job to do in the next few months which it is totally incapable of doing. It is not staffed up for that.

I have in my hand the annual report, a recent one of the Commission. It has been engaged over a number of years in the complex, complicated job which takes time of analyzing the validity of claims made by U.S. citizens or property taken from them by expropriation of foreign governments. Currently the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is totally focused on the job of evaluating and considering certain claims. The Commission is totally engaged today in reviewing and evaluating the claims against the East German Government for compensation there.

Its next step probably under the legislation which is now under active consideration will be to do the same thing with regard to Vietnam. This is extremely complicated. You have to give the claimants time to come in and file their claims, show their validity. It cannot be done in a matter of weeks. If it is done in a matter of weeks, it is going to be improperly done, particularly since the Commission has a very small staff, a few dozen people, probably less than 50, and they are totally engaged in one evaluation at a time.

This amendment would require them to evaluate within a space of a few days the validity of claims made against the Nicaraguan Government.

Now, the regular way in which this should be done, if it is to be done, and there is no reason why it cannot be done, is to amend the act that provides for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. It can then review the claims and see that the claimants get proper compensation when that is negotiated out.

There is another flaw with this amendment, which the gentleman from Iowa pointed to, but I think I would like to be more precise. This amendment which attempts to track the Hickenlooper amendment does not follow the provisions of the Hickenlooper amendment in terms of timing. The Hickenlooper amendment does say that under certain circumstances these matters of claims can be deferred to the Foreign Settlement Claims Commission. That, as a matter of fact, has never been done for the reasons that I first outlined, that the Commission is not capable of handling that kind of a job. It does not have the overseas staff to do that; but if it were done under the Hickenlooper amendment, there would then be a period after it submits its report of 6 months. The penalty does not apply as long as the government concerned is reasonably negotiating for the payment of claims. My information is that the firms, and there are only a couple of them that have not settled in Nicaragua, are en-

gaged in negotiations. It would be impossible for the Commission to determine at this particular time or 2 months from now that the government had failed to meet its obligations under international law. What it is required to do under international law, for example, may be settled by arbitration.

Again I say, these are enormously complicated questions. They came up in the case of Chile under the Allende government. They have come up with a number of other cases. It takes time to resolve them. It cannot be done in a matter of weeks with a cutoff date such as this amendment would presume to impose.

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in support of the Lent amendment.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULZE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Central American Assistance Act of 1979 which will provide \$75 million in economic aid to the Marxist leadership in Nicaragua and only \$5 million in aid to Honduras. I know that the proponents of this legislation claim that this aid is going to assist the remaining democratic forces in the country and that it will be directed to the private sector. I also know that the supporters of this legislation will try to claim that if we assist Nicaragua in rebuilding its economy, then they will remain our friends and we will not experience the same situation which occurred in Cuba. To all of my well-intentioned colleagues I say, take a closer look.

The private sector, what is left of it, is controlled by the Sandinistas. The Sandinistas have enacted three decrees that give them a stranglehold on private enterprise in the country. First, they nationalized all banks and allocate the credit to those businesses which they determine are in line with the junta. Second, the Sandinistas have taken over the foreign marketing of agricultural products which comprise 80 percent of Nicaraguan exports. In this way, the government is now using farm prices to force the pace of collectivization and carry out their announced objective of land reform. Third, the government struck at the remaining elements of the middle class by calling in all currency in \$50 and \$100 denominations on the grounds of preventing Somoza from destabilizing the currency with his stolen wealth. This move was particularly disastrous for small proprietors who took their savings out of the banks during the revolution.

Therefore, I seriously question how our Government could think it would be aiding the private sector with the \$75 million in loans and grants. We would merely be placing this money in the hands of the Sandinistas to carry out the solidification of their regime throughout the country. We would actually be working against the remaining democratic elements of the country, since they would be overpowered by the Sandinista-sanc-

tioned businesses and other agents of the Marxist regime.

Clearly, the Sandinistas have a tight hold on the reigns of power in Nicaragua. Self-appointed Sandinista committees have taken charge in the cities and control food distribution, the issuing of exit visas and passports, and many other activities. It seems almost impossible that any group not sanctioned by the ruling Marxists could obtain some of the aid proposed by the United States and use that aid to foster democratic ideals.

It is interesting to note, also, what the Sandinistas are saying about this proposed aid and what they think of their great friend, the United States. From the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, I have obtained an editorial which aired on December 30, 1979, on the Advance radio network in Nicaragua. In discussing the proposed U.S. aid package, the editorial states:

All this sounds very good to some circles here, but let us look now at the intentions of that imperialist country's rulers.

According to an AP report in a local paper, members of the Carter government have said one of the objectives of the "aid" is to promote a coalition government in Nicaragua instead of a Marxist regime, which implies pressure to give the bourgeoisie and the oligarchy a prominent place in the Nicaraguan government.

From the economic viewpoint, the interventionist aspirations of the imperialist banks have not changed in essence, only in form. The aim is to perpetuate their political influence with the support, this time of reformist groups in Latin America and international reactionaries.

\*\*\* the Imperialists are clearly demonstrating their intention to maintain neocolonialist domination in a more subtle and thus more dangerous manner. Of course, it will be very difficult for them to intervene successfully in today's Nicaragua, but it is important to know what kind of aid we can expect from the U.S. Government: usurious loans with interventionist intentions. To believe otherwise is to daydream.

And that, Mr. Chairman, is what the Sandinistas think of our glorious efforts to provide their country with financial aid. Of course, they will gladly take the aid. Why not take a \$75 million gift which will help bolster the power of the Sandinista regime in the country and further squelch any remaining voices of democracy.

What is even more frightening about this aid is that it will be used to help further destabilization and subversion in the remainder of free Central America. The Cubans and the Soviets were heavily involved in the Sandinistas overthrow of the Somoza government by providing weapons, advisory personnel, and various forms of aid. It appears that the next targets in this strategic part of the world are El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. The United States is naive if it thinks some of this aid to Nicaragua will not go to funding subversion in these other nations.

In light of all these facts, I urge my colleagues to reject this aid package to further spread Marxism throughout Central America. The administration already made one serious mistake by helping to destabilize Somoza's power. Let us



not add to that by providing financial support to push the remaining free states in Central America into the Marxist camp.

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in opposition to this legislation and in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from New York (Mr. LENT).

Let me say that it is, in my mind, not in the best interest of our Nation to grant aid to this Cuban-backed Sandinista government. We cannot simply overlook the flagrant violations of human rights and freedoms that this government has committed against its own citizens. Nor can we overlook similar atrocities which have been committed against citizens of our own country.

Let me cite as an example of the Sandinista's total lack of respect for human rights the case of an Episcopalian bishop, who is a constituent of mine. Bishop Derek Lang first went to Nicaragua in 1972 to assist in Managua earthquake relief activities. After studying the long-term health needs of the Nicaraguans, Bishop Lang set out to build a hospital in the neediest part of the country. A small, ten-bed emergency hospital at the edge of the jungle was erected. After about 4½ years of operation, the hospital had aided almost 15,000 patients, and was functioning smoothly until the hospital and its personnel were stranded behind Sandinista lines. I now quote from Bishop Lang's recent letter accounting the events which followed:

Everything was going well there until the insurrection hit our area. As I said, we were behind Sandinista lines May 13 to August 9. During this time, I was terrorized, arrested twice, beaten with the barrel of a machine gun and viciously kicked and battered, the hospital was systematically looted, personal property was stolen, and ultimately, the whole facility was confiscated. All of this was in accordance with the official policy of the Sandinista government! I felt myself very fortunate, indeed, to get out of that country with the clothing on my back . . . alive.

I was and am outraged by the treatment accorded myself and my staff, but I am even more outraged that the Government of the United States would now—in effect—reward the brutality and extortion of American property by now funneling large sums of money to assist these people. It is my view that from the very moment the Sandinista's took up arms against the constitutional government, they became fully responsible for the consequences of its acts. One of the consequences was the loss of many years of work on my part on behalf of the people there, as well as the material and economic losses sustained. In a word, it is my view that the present Nicaraguan Government has an obligation to indemnify me for the property it expropriated.

We must remember that the brutality suffered by Bishop Lang was not an isolated act of terrorism, but rather represents the accepted ideology and behavior of the Sandinista government.

Should this legislative body vote in favor of granting aid to Nicaragua, it would be grossly unfair to pass such legislation without an amendment to assure equitable compensation to American

citizens whose property has been seized by the Sandinista government. Therefore, I ask that my colleagues keep in mind the example I have cited, and join me in support of this worthwhile amendment.

□ 1750

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULZE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman cited a letter that he had received from a Bishop Derek Lang?

Mr. SCHULZE. Bishop Lang. I will be glad to provide the gentleman with a copy of the letter.

Mr. HARKIN. Bishop Derek Lang, would he be the Bishop of Middleburg?

Mr. SCHULZE. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I have in my hands a letter, a copy of a letter which went to the Ambassador of Nicaragua by a so-called Bishop Derek Lang, and it is signed Bishop of Middleburg. In his letter he states:

I will be attending the congressional hearings in my official capacity as a Catholic Bishop and as a former missionary to your country, able to provide the Congress with a first-hand report of my own experiences before, during, and after your government came into power.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(At the request of Mr. HARKIN and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHULZE was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCHULZE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARKIN. We checked with the Catholic diocese in Pennsylvania. There is no such person as Bishop Derek Lang in the Catholic church.

Mr. SCHULZE. Does the gentleman know the meaning of the word "catholic?"

Mr. HARKIN. He says, "A Catholic bishop," and he has got a little seal up here on the letterhead.

Mr. SCHULZE. That does not necessarily mean a Roman Catholic. The word "catholic" means Christian in that phrase. I am not putting myself in his mind, but I presume he may be saying a member of the Christian church. I do not know. I cannot answer for what Bishop Lang says.

Mr. HARKIN. Can the gentleman assure this body that there is, indeed, a Bishop of Middleburg whose name is Derek Lang?

Mr. SCHULZE. I can assure the gentleman that I have received a letter from a constituent of mine. That is—

Mr. HARKIN. I would submit there is no such human being.

Mr. SCHULZE. Well, I think if the gentleman would like to delay the bill until we bring Bishop Lang here, I would be happy to do so.

Mr. HARKIN. I would like to meet the guy that wrote this letter.

Mr. SCHULZE. If the gentleman would like to move to suspend this operation until we bring Bishop Lang here, I would be happy to present him to the gentleman. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

I shall be brief. The proponents of this amendment might be well intentioned in protecting the rights of American businessmen in Nicaragua whose properties have been expropriated, but let me put on the record that at least one claim has already been settled and others that are now pending are in various stages of settlement.

The amendment seeks to be punitive in that it would impose a shorter space of time for the consideration of adequate compensation for expropriation than the Hickenlooper amendment. But I would respectfully suggest to my colleagues that by mandatory referral of the American businessman's claim to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, what it will do is delay the possibility of a settlement of that claim in a proper, timely fashion with adequate compensation. I am sure the gentleman did not have that in mind, but that is what his amendment will do by mandatory referral of the claim by the President to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission when right now the dispute can be taken up by negotiation directly between the company and the foreign government.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LENT).

The question was taken and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—ayes 192, yeas 197, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

#### AYES—192

Abdnor	Buchanan	Early
Albosta	Burgener	Emery
Ambro	Butler	English
Anderson,	Byron	Erlenborn
Calif.	Campbell	Ertel
Andrews,	Carney	Evans, Del.
N. Dak.	Carter	Evans, Ind.
Applegate	Chappell	Findley
Archer	Clausen	Fish
Ashbrook	Coelho	Flippo
Atkinson	Coleman	Florio
Badham	Collins, Tex.	Fountain
Bafalis	Conable	Gaydos
Balley	Corcoran	Gillman
Bauman	Coughlin	Gingrich
Beard, Tenn.	Courter	Glickman
Benjamin	Crane, Daniel	Goldwater
Bennett	Daniel, Dan	Goodling
Bereuter	Daniel, R. W.	Gradison
Bethune	Dannemeyer	Gramm
Bevill	Davis, Mich.	Grassley
Brinkley	Deckard	Grisham
Brooks	Derwinski	Guyer
Broomfield	Dickinson	Hall, Tex.
Brown, Ohio	Donnelly	Hammer-
Broyhill	Duncan, Tenn.	schmitt

Hansen	McKay	Sebelius	Steed	Van Deerlin	Whitten
Harscha	Madigan	Sensenbrenner	Stewart	Vento	Wirth
Heckler	Shelby	Shelby	Stokes	Volkmer	Wolpe
Hefner	Marriott	Shumway	Studds	Walgren	Wright
Hillis	Martin	Shuster	Swift	Waxman	Yates
Hinson	Mathis	Smith, Nebr.	Thompson	Weaver	Young, Mo.
Hollenbeck	Mazzoli	Snowe	Udall	Weiss	Zablocki
Holt	Mica	Snyder	Ullman	Whitley	
Hopkins	Michel	Solomon			
Huckaby	Miller, Ohio	Spence			
Hutto	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stangeland			
Hyde	Moorhead,	Stenholm			
Ichord	Calif.	Stratton			
Jacobs	Mottl	Stump			
Jeffries	Murphy, N.Y.	Synar			
Jenkins	Murphy, Pa.	Tauke			
Jones, Okla.	Myers, Ind.	Taylor			
Kelly	Nichols	Thomas			
Kemp	O'Brien	Traxler			
Kindness	Pashayan	Tribble			
Kostmayer	Paul	Walker			
Kramer	Pickle	Wampler			
Lagomarsino	Porter	Watkins			
Latta	Pursell	White			
Leach, Iowa	Quayle	Whitehurst			
Leath, Tex.	Quillen	Whittaker			
Lederer	Rallsback	Williams, Mont.			
Lee	Regula	Williams, Ohio			
Lent	Rhodes	Wilson, Bob			
Levitas	Rinaldo	Wilson, Tex.			
Lewis	Ritter	Winn			
Livingston	Robinson	Wolff			
Loeffler	Roe	Wyatt			
Lott	Roth	Wydler			
Lujan	Royer	Wylie			
Lungren	Rudd	Yatron			
McClary	Runnels	Young, Fla.			
McDade	Satterfield	Zeferetti			
McDonald	Sawyer				
McEwen	Schulze				

## NOES—197

Addabbo	Ford, Mich.	Mikulski
Akaka	Ford, Tenn.	Miller, Calif.
Andrews, N.C.	Fowler	Mineta
Annunzio	Fuqua	Minish
Anthony	Garcia	Mitchell, Md.
Ashley	Gephardt	Moakley
Aspin	Gibbons	Moffett
AuCoin	Ginn	Mollohan
Baldus	Gonzalez	Moorhead, Pa.
Barnes	Gore	Murtha
Beard, R.I.	Gray	Myers, Pa.
Bedell	Green	Natcher
Beilenson	Guarini	Neal
Bingham	Gudger	Nedzi
Blanchard	Hall, Ohio	Nelson
Boland	Hamilton	Nolan
Bolling	Hance	Nowak
Bonior	Hanley	Oakar
Bonker	Harkin	Oberstar
Bouquard	Harris	Obey
Bowen	Hawkins	Panetta
Brademas	Hefel	Patten
Brodhead	Hightower	Patterson
Brown, Calif.	Holland	Pease
Burlison	Horton	Pepper
Burton, John	Howard	Perkins
Burton, Phillip	Hubbard	Petri
Carr	Hughes	Peyser
Cavanaugh	Ireland	Preyer
Cheney	Jeffords	Price
Clay	Jenrette	Pritchard
Clinger	Johnson, Calif.	Rahall
Collins, Ill.	Johnson, Colo.	Rangel
Conte	Jones, N.C.	Reuss
Corman	Jones, Tenn.	Richmond
Cotter	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Danielson	Kazen	Rose
Daschle	Kildee	Rosenthal
de la Garza	Kogovsek	Rostenkowski
Dellums	LaFalce	Roybal
Dicks	Leach, La.	Russo
Diggs	Lehman	Sabo
Dingell	Leland	Scheuer
Dodd	Lloyd	Schroeder
Downey	Long, La.	Seiberling
Drinan	Long, Md.	Shannon
Eckhardt	Lowry	Sharp
Edgar	Luken	Simon
Edwards, Calif.	Lundine	Skelton
Evans, Ga.	McCormack	Slack
Fary	McHugh	Smith, Iowa
Fascell	McKinney	Solarz
Fazio	Maguire	Spellman
Fenwick	Markey	St Germain
Ferraro	Marks	Stack
Fisher	Matsui	Staggers
Fithian	Mattox	Stanton
Foley	Mavroules	Stark

Steed	Van Deerlin	Whitten
Stewart	Vento	Wirth
Stokes	Volkmer	Wolpe
Studds	Walgren	Wright
Swift	Waxman	Yates
Thompson	Weaver	Young, Mo.
Udall	Weiss	Zablocki
Ullman	Whitley	

## NOT VOTING—44

Alexander	Dixon	Moore
Anderson, Ill.	Dornan	Murphy, Ill.
Barnard	Dougherty	Ottlinger
Blaggi	Duncan, Oreg.	Ratchford
Boggs	Edwards, Ala.	Roberts
Boner	Edwards, Okla.	Rousselot
Breaux	Erdahl	Santini
Chisholm	Forsythe	Stockman
Cleveland	Frenzel	Symms
Conyers	Frost	Treen
Crane, Philip	Gialmo	Vander Jagt
D'Amours	Hagedorn	Vanik
Davis, S.C.	Holtzman	Wilson, C. H.
Derrick	McCloskey	Young, Alaska
Devine	Montgomery	

## □ 1810

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hagedorn for, with Mr. Blaggi against.  
 Mr. Forsythe for, with Mrs. Boggs against.  
 Mr. Symms for, with Mr. Conyers against.  
 Mr. Dornan for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California against.  
 Mr. Devine for, with Ms. Holtzman against.  
 Mr. Rousselot for, with Mr. Dixon against.  
 Mr. Young of Alaska for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.

Mr. McKINNEY and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. McKAY, ALBOSTA, GOODLING, and COELHO changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BRADEMAs) having assumed the chair, Mr. PANETTA, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6081) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize assistance in support of peaceful and democratic processes of development in Central America, had come to no resolution thereon.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill just under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

# REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 643, REFUGEE ACT OF 1980

Mr. BEILENSON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-786) on the resolution (H. Res. 586) waiving certain points of order against the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 643) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to revise the procedures for the admission of refugees, to amend the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 to establish a more uniform basis for the provision of assistance to refugees, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## ECONOMIC CRISIS AND A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, in recent days there has been a growing sense of panic over the release of the latest economic indicators showing inflation growing at more than 18 percent a year. The response to this panic has been a renewed interest in wage and price controls. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and others, however, have suggested that greater restraint in spending would be a better approach. Others have called for some kind of "shock action" that would break the economy out of the inexorable slide toward higher and higher inflation rates that it is now locked into.

While there are many possible approaches to the problem and many parties who have a role to play in its creation and solution, it is clear that the Congress does have a responsibility to act. Indeed, the clearest opportunity that the Congress does have comes when the first concurrent budget resolution is brought before the House. For years now, the Congress has debated, studied, and moved toward a balanced Federal budget. As a result of congressional actions, the Budget Committee in the last session indicated a series of actions that might lead to a balanced budget, and the President has done the same thing this year in his budget message. The information is there.

In this sense, the balanced budget approach, because it is within Congress control and because it is well understood, is a more achievable goal than implementation of wage and price controls, about which we know very little. Economists still argue about the impact of past experiments with controls, and obviously the kind and degree of implementation of any new program will affect its success. By contrast, we know how to balance the budget, and we can quite reasonably predict its impact on the economy and inflation rate.

As part of its responsibility to study areas of budget-cutting, the Budget



Committee's Task Force on Legislative Savings, which I chair, has received recommendations for savings in 56 different program areas from the Congressional Budget Office. These savings, which total more than \$52 billion, are mostly in addition to the \$5.6 billion in savings proposed by the President in his budget. In addition, the Task Force has generated billions of dollars worth of other savings proposals from its hearings last year and from on-going work with the General Accounting Office.

Right now, the CBO proposals and others are undergoing close scrutiny by a number of Republican and Democratic members of the Budget Committee, in preparation for the markup of the budget resolution. There is a very real drive to use these analyses to move to a balanced budget to be reported by the Budget Committee to the House.

As part of this effort, the Task Force on Legislative Savings will be holding hearings on March 10 to examine the CBO proposals and others in greater detail and to receive additional suggestions for reductions that can be implemented within the fiscal 1981 time frame. I would like to take this opportunity to invite those Members who do have suggestions on how to do this to let me know, so that these ideas can be incorporated into the hearings, or so that testimony can be scheduled.

Finally, let me remind every Member that he or she has a unique opportunity to affect the shape of the 1981 budget, even before it is marked up by the Budget Committee. In the very near future, every committee in the House will begin considering its March 15 report to the Budget Committee, laying out new areas of spending and reduction expected by the committee. Every Member, as a member of a standing committee, can push for that committee to recommend legislation that will reduce spending in program areas. The Budget Committee needs those ideas and will almost certainly incorporate them into the markup document, if they are recommended by a committee. Again, I cannot stress strongly enough what a significant opportunity this is for you to affect the 1981 budget.

These actions, taken together, can lead us to a balanced budget, if we are willing to put aside the special interests we all have that have driven Federal spending to its record-high levels. A balanced budget this spring, in turn, would be a real signal to the administration, the American people, business and labor, that we are serious about asking everyone to make some sacrifice to bring inflation under control and end its devastating effect on our lives.

#### BILL INTRODUCED PROPOSING TO UNITED NATIONS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERNATIONAL OFFICE OF DIPLOMATIC SECURITY

(Mr. FITHIAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

CXXVI—244—Part 3

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill expressing the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should take appropriate actions to obtain the support of foreign states for, and to present a proposal to, the United Nations for the establishment of an International Office of Diplomatic Security within the U.N. Secretariat. The purpose of this Office would be to monitor compliance of signator nations with international agreements which guarantee the protection of diplomatic missions and their personnel.

The inviolability of diplomats and the premises of diplomatic missions is one of the oldest and most fundamental principles of international law. For centuries this principle has enjoyed universal acceptance as an essential element for peaceful relations among all nations of the world. Yet, over the last decade, erosion of this principle has become an international disgrace. Scores of diplomats from various countries have been kidnapped, harassed, wounded, and killed because of inadequate diplomatic protection from local governments—governments which are obligated under international law to provide such protection. This past year, we have seen the governments of countries, which are signators of international agreements guaranteeing protection of diplomats, overtly or tacitly encourage brutal attacks on diplomatic missions located in their territory. Our own Embassies in Iran, Pakistan and Libya were overrun by mobs; recently the Spanish Embassy in Guatemala was invaded by forces of the local government. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance has called diplomatic service for the United States abroad "hazardous frontline duty," and the Department of State has requested millions to improve security against terrorist attacks for our diplomatic posts abroad. Violence and the threat of violence have become unavoidable facts of contemporary diplomacy. The search for peace cannot prosper where terrorism reigns.

To reverse this destructive trend, we must restore respect for and observance of international agreements guaranteeing protection of diplomats and the missions to which they are assigned. Establishment of an International Office of Diplomatic Security would do much toward accomplishing this goal.

I would like to briefly describe how this Office would function. The multilateral agreements which the International Office of Diplomatic Security would seek to enforce have already been signed and ratified by the international community. Others may refine and improve them, but those existing set forth accepted standards of diplomatic security in international law. The United Nations is in fact the repository of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and other international agreements guaranteeing protection of diplomats. Giving an organization of the U.N. a mandate to enhance compliance with these agreements would be a natural extension of the United Nations' mission to promote peaceful relations among its members.

The International Office of Diplomatic Security could operate with a small staff at U.N. headquarters and several regional representatives. The latter would periodically visit countries in their regions to evaluate diplomatic security through discussion with local authorities, members of the various resident diplomatic missions and other concerned groups. These representatives would also be prepared to travel to countries where a visit is requested by a state concerned for the safety of its diplomatic personnel, or where a deteriorating security situation warrants on-the-spot investigation.

When the International Office of Diplomatic Security determines that a government is not providing security in keeping with accepted international standards, it would immediately bring this to the attention of the host government. If a government so informed does not take prompt corrective action, then the Office would issue a warning to all states that it is unsafe for foreign diplomats in that country.

This resolution also recommends a mechanism for the U.N. to either entertain motions to sanction the delinquent country, or, if appropriate, to consider providing international assistance to enable that country adequately to protect its resident foreign diplomats.

This is not a complicated nor frivolous resolution. The international office it urges established is a practical and timely response to a compelling international problem. It is a problem which the United States cannot hope to effectively address alone. We can build barricades around our Embassies all over the world, but American diplomats abroad will still be in danger until international consensus on the necessity for all nations to provide adequate protection for diplomats has been restored. To meet this challenge, we must work in concert with other nations which are no less concerned than our own about the security of their people.

Today the United Nations' role in handling disputes between nations over violence against diplomats is to attempt to mediate already-raging confrontations. It tries to minimize damage to international peace in conflicts over whose origins it has little or no control. The International Office of Diplomatic Security would give the U.N. an active, ongoing intermediary role. Through regular liaison with local governments, it could do much to prevent deteriorating security from reaching the point that foreign diplomats are placed in imminent danger. Governments with domestic violence problems would be accountable on diplomatic security to a specific international organization rather than an inchoate ideal of international law—an ideal which in many parts of the world has been forgotten or is ignored with impunity. Bilateral representations to unresponsive governments over diplomatic security would, through the International Office of Diplomatic Security, be reinforced by the united voice of the international community.

There is a very important element of my resolution which I want to especially recommend to the attention of Members of this body. That is the provision whereby the International Office of Diplomatic Security would issue a warning to other states when it finds conditions in a given country unsafe for foreign diplomats. Such a warning would give the United States and other nations international sanction for removing diplomats from danger. What happened in Tehran may have been prevented if such a system had been in effect. No U.S. administration has deliberately endangered the lives of its diplomats, but historically it has been very difficult to make the decision to unilaterally pull out our diplomatic personnel. It is extremely difficult to abandon the field in a troubled country which may be a traditional friend of the United States. Such a withdrawal is an explicit expression of complete lack of confidence in a government's ability to maintain order. Such a withdrawal can potentially do serious damage to future relations with that country. The temptation, even in an obviously dangerous environment, is to give an unstable government the benefit of the doubt on security. Introducing an outside international judgment would minimize damage to our bilateral relations and greatly lower the threshold for reducing our diplomatic presence when a doubtful security situation exists.

When an International Office of Diplomatic Security is effectively carrying out its mandate, we can reasonably hope that there will be no more diplomatic missions taken over by terrorists; that there will be no more Tehrans. What happened at the American Embassy in Tehran must never happen again. We in this Congress owe it to those 50 or more hostages to insure that such a violation of universal standards of conduct is never repeated. Let us through passage of this resolution seek to put in place an organization which may spare our own or another nation such a trial. I urge my colleagues to support this timely and practical approach to a problem which can no longer be tolerated on the international scene.

#### SHUSTER BLASTS USRA CONRAIL STUDY

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, as former Chairman of the National Transportation Policy Commission and as ranking member of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, I rise today to comment on the U.S. Railway Association's report released on February 23, 1980, entitled "An Evaluation of the Marketing and Competitive Aspects of Limited Access by Other Rail Carriers into ConRail's Region." Mr. Speaker, this report is one of the most inane, incomplete and incompetent pieces of purported economic

analysis of transportation that I have ever seen.

The USRA has studied the question of whether additional railroads should be permitted to compete against ConRail without even addressing three fundamental issues: First, no estimate of the effect on operation and capital costs on ConRail or other carriers was made; second, no estimate of the financial impact on the Federal Government or other parties could be undertaken; and third, each case was studied independently of the other. The effects of combinations of the packages were not studied. It is absolutely absurd to discuss increasing railroad competition against ConRail without evaluating the financial impact on ConRail. For the USRA conclusion to state that "increased competition has a negative effect on ConRail's carloadings and freight revenue" is tantamount to acknowledging that the Sun rises every morning.

If there were a high degree of demand elasticity in the railroad industry then increased competition in a financially depressed industry might be justified. However, USRA does not make this argument, nor could they since demand in the railroad industry is highly inelastic. There is only so much freight to be hauled, and increasing competition will not increase the quantity of that freight. In fact, the manufacturing base in the Northeast has been declining over the past 20 years, thereby shrinking the market for rail services relative to the rest of the country.

It is obvious from this sophomoric study, which could not get a passing grade in a beginning economics class, that we could save the taxpayers some money by getting rid of the USRA.

The USRA chose 5 separate proposals or packages for analysis, which were:

First. Entry of the Chessie System into New Jersey over the former Reading & Lehigh Valley lines;

Second. Entry of a southern carrier into Indianapolis from Cincinnati via Lawrenceburg, Ind.;

3. Entry of a western carrier into Indianapolis from St. Louis via Mattoon, Ill. and Greencastle, Ind.;

Fourth. Extension of the Toledo, Peoria & Western from Logansport, Ind. to Columbus, Ohio; and

Fifth. Expanded access of the Delaware & Hudson in northern New Jersey via the former Lehigh Valley line and improvement of D. & H. routes to Philadelphia and Washington, D.C.

The USRA acknowledged that the packages do not represent recommendations of the association, but are merely examples of some markets presently served by ConRail which may be attractive candidates for other carriers.

Those who want to see a revitalized railroad system in America surely must know that ConRail cannot be made more profitable by increasing rail competition in the region it serves. If more people are competing for the same pie, everyone

gets a smaller slice. If one lemonade stand in the neighborhood cannot get enough business to be profitable, putting up a second one in the same area certainly will not help improve business. It is bad enough that taxpayers are asked to support one railroad in the Northeast. I do not believe they would take kindly to being asked to subsidize several.

Mr. Speaker, ConRail does not need more competition, ConRail needs more business, and those of us who want to see a better transportation system in the Northeast would do well to work to improve ConRail rather than destroy it.

#### CONGRESSMAN SHARP INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO SET A REASONABLE LIMITATION ON COAL SEVERANCE TAXES OF 12.5 PERCENT

(Mr. SHARP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, as we consider our national goals for the 1980's, we must recognize two compelling lessons of the last decade: The need for national unity in confronting threats to American prosperity, and the even more pressing need to free this Nation from our crippling dependence on petroleum imports.

The Iranian situation and the unrelenting OPEC price increases of recent years make it glaringly obvious that we can no longer afford to place our energy future in the hands of the economically greedy and politically unstable nations of the Middle East. The threat of the Russian presence on Iran's borders underlines the urgency of our need for freedom from dependence on imported oil.

Our vast coal reserves clearly can help free us from the domination of OPEC. In fact, the United States has more coal than the oil reserves of all the OPEC nations combined. As Members of this Congress and the administration have recognized repeatedly in these last 4 years, now is the time for all of us to cooperate in developing this great national resource, as a substitute for foreign oil, with maximum efficiency and minimum economic restraint.

National policy presently requires utilities and industries to limit their use of oil and natural gas. This greatly enhances the market importance of Montana and Wyoming coal, strengthening their ability to charge exorbitant taxes.

These excessive tax rates are a burden on interstate commerce. They are an impediment to achieving national energy goals. They add to inflation and are unfair to consumers.

The States of Montana and Wyoming together hold nearly half of America's coal, and the importance of their coal to the United States will clearly grow. Their coal severance taxes are far higher than taxes on any energy-producing resource in any other State.



Wyoming's tax is 17 percent, and Montana's is an overwhelming 30 percent. The revenues from these exorbitant taxes far exceed any costs these States bear to support coal production, and, indeed, Montana places a full 50 percent of its severance tax earnings in a trust fund to collect interest for the indefinite future.

What is especially outrageous about these exploitive taxes is the fact that they are borne principally by consumers in 20 other States, who have no voting voice in deciding the rates of tax they must pay. Most of these consumers are utilities who use this coal to produce electricity and pass the cost of these exorbitant severance taxes on to their rate-paying customers.

Mr. Speaker, these excessive taxes are indefensible from any point of view. They threaten our national energy policy goal of increasing coal production, they contribute to inflation, and they are absolutely unrelated in amount to any coal development costs the States bear now or will bear in the foreseeable future. But unless some restraint is imposed, these States will continue to exact these oppressive coal taxes, and will tempt other coal producing States to indulge in similar tax profiteering.

The only power to check this trend to coal tax profiteering lies with the Federal Government. Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation which will set a reasonable limitation on coal severance taxes of 12.5 percent.

This limitation leaves ample leeway for States to obtain compensation for the costs they actually bear to support coal production. However, it will prevent further severance tax exploitation and remind all States that we must work together to develop American coal and end our dependence on imported oil.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and all the Members of this Congress to join me in supporting this much needed legislation. We must not encourage the practices of a domestic OPEC if we are to free ourselves from the domination of the OPEC abroad.

□ 1210

#### REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE JIM COURTER REGARDING THE HISTORIC EXCHANGE OF AMBASSADORS BETWEEN EGYPT AND ISRAEL

(Mr. COURTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, today marks an historic occasion in contemporary Middle East history. For the first time since its creation in 1948, the State of Israel has full diplomatic relations with an Arab State: Egypt. I wish Egyptian Ambassador to Israel, Saad Murtada, and Israeli Ambassador to Egypt, Eliahu Ben-Elissar, the very best of luck in their difficult yet unique roles.

Egypt, the most populous and strongest of the Arab States, under the wise and courageous leadership of President Sadat, has decided that peace with Israel is the correct course of action for his nation. The main external threats

to Egypt are the Soviet Union and Libya, not Israel. Two weeks ago, President Sadat was quoted as saying before the Egyptian people's assembly that Israel:

Completely, honorably and sincerely carried out its commitments . . . when they sign a document, they honor it. This has happened with Golda Meir and with Begin. When they sign, they honor their signature and implement agreements with integrity and honor.

As for Israel, she, too, is taking grave risks. Her defense lines will eventually revert to the vulnerable border of 1967. Yet, for Israel, the promise of peace is worth the risks. I am convinced that both peoples are tired of war and long for a peaceful and enduring relationship.

In order to insure the continued viability of the peace process, I believe that it is of the utmost importance that the United States continue to give its strong diplomatic, economic, and military support to both nations. Military support to Israel must continue at the levels she requires and will require to defend herself against any eventuality. At the same time, Egypt must have the arms she needs for legitimate self-defense.

Finally, I believe that the relationship between these two nations must stand on its own. Yes; there are other problems to be solved, but let us give peace a chance to take hold without artificial deadlines regarding other matters. May this momentous occasion be only the beginning of a new era of peace in the Middle East that will act as a bulwark against Soviet expansion in that region. On this occasion, let us remember the words of President Sadat who said today:

Let every one of us light a candle of compassion and understanding. With God's help we shall overcome.

#### ENERGY CONSERVATION TAX INCENTIVE ACT OF 1979

(Mr. KRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will provide incentive to all Americans to conserve energy in their homes and places of business.

The Energy Conservation Tax Incentive Act of 1979, will amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide certain tax incentives for expenditures resulting in energy conservation. As you may know, the Energy Tax Act of 1978 provided for tax credits to individuals and businesses for energy conservation. Under this act, a citizen can claim a 15-percent tax credit (up to \$2,000) for expenditures for energy conservation property such as insulation, storm windows and clock thermostats. The act also provides to individuals a 30-percent tax credit for the first \$2,000 of expenditures and a 20-percent credit for the next \$8,000 on solar, wind and geothermal equipment. For businesses, the act provides a 10-percent tax credit for the installation of certain energy conserving equipment.

This legislation will double the 15-percent residential credit to 30 percent and increase the 30 percent residential renewable energy credit to 50 percent. It will double the business credit from 10 to 20 percent.

In addition, the bill will expand the categories for which the credit can be claimed. It will allow the residential energy tax credit to be claimed for the purchase of heat pumps, air-tight woodstoves, replacement of oil and gas furnaces as well as for other proven energy saving devices. My bill extends the credit to landlords and joint owners of homes, and will allow citizens to claim the credits on other than primary residences. The legislation provides that the business credit can be claimed for the retrofitting of equipment that is 10 percent more energy efficient and for the purchase of waste heat recovery equipment.

Finally, in order to assist citizens in making informed choices on the type of energy alterations they make to their homes and businesses, this legislation provides a 75 percent tax credit for costs incurred when having an energy audit made by a certified engineer. In addition, a 50 percent tax credit is provided for the costs incurred in having a certified engineer check the continued energy efficiency of the home or place of business each year after alterations have been made.

Energy tax credits have proved successful. The IRS reports that almost 6 million people claimed the credit during the first year. This success was achieved despite the strict limitations which are imposed on claiming these credits.

This legislation will make optimum use of this successful tool to encourage energy conservation. In addition, using tax credits to encourage energy conservation has several advantages. As pointed out, tax credits actually do encourage people to make energy saving alterations on their homes and businesses. Tax credits do not necessitate the establishment of a new government bureaucracy. They allow citizens to choose which type of alteration is most appropriate for their home. Finally, this bill allows citizens to choose and employ a qualified certified engineer to provide the energy audit.

The need to find immediate solutions to our energy problems is great. Conservation can play a major role in getting us through the critical years ahead. However, the impact conservation can make depends upon how many Americans join in the effort. With this bill, the government can promote a policy that will give incentive to all American citizens to become energy conservers.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE HARLEY O. STAGGERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADEMAS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on this special

order paying tribute to the Honorable HARLEY STAGGERS of West Virginia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to not only pay tribute, but to thank one of the most distinguished men who have ever served in this Chamber, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, for his many years of dedicated service to the State of West Virginia and to the Nation.

Since 1948, HARLEY STAGGERS has represented the 22 counties that comprise the Second Congressional District of West Virginia, at a high level of public service that will be hard to match.

Born in Keyser, W. Va., the son of Jacob and Frances Staggers, he attended public schools in Mineral County and was awarded an A.B. degree from Emory and Henry College.

HARLEY STAGGERS has been a teacher, a football coach, a brakeman on the railroad, a rubber worker in Akron, worked in the wheat fields of Oklahoma and Kansas, a sheriff, a veteran, a Congressman, and most of all, an extremely decent man.

As chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, HARLEY STAGGERS has engineered many major pieces of legislation through this body. Such as: Measures affecting the health of our children, consumer protection, transportation, communications, environmental quality, and a national energy policy.

The scope of HARLEY STAGGERS' accomplishments may really never be felt, until he is no longer a Member of this House.

The impact of his decision, announced yesterday, not to seek reelection cannot be completely felt at this time. His absence will be felt, when this House grapples with issues that HARLEY STAGGERS dealt with with such ease and understanding.

Having myself been elected in 1976, HARLEY STAGGERS has been of tremendous help to me. As the senior member of the West Virginia delegation, he set an example and work load, not easy to follow. One can only try to be like HARLEY STAGGERS, no one however, will ever take his place.

I wish him, his wife Mary and their six children the very best. They deserve this time that they will have together.

It is ironic, I guess, that just a week ago today, I joined Mr. JOHNSON, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, who I am honored to serve under, in introducing a measure to name the Federal building in Morgantown, W. Va., the "Harley O. Staggers Federal Building."

At the time this bill was introduced, we had no idea of HARLEY's plans. Now the decision to submit this measure takes on new light, and I urge my colleagues to join us in the speedy passage of this very small attempt to honor a man we will not forget.

I will miss him. You will miss him. But we can all be assured that our time as

Members of this House were enriched by the presence of HARLEY O. STAGGERS.

□ 1820

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to compliment him for taking this time.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no more fitting beneficiary of the tribute the gentleman has given here than my chairman. I would just like to say a few things about my experience on the committee with the chairman of my committee. I do not think there has ever been a time in the history of this country and the history of this House in which there was more pressure on a chairman of a committee and on a full committee to take action in favor of a special interest than the period in which HARLEY STAGGERS has served on the committee as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; nor has there ever been a time when a man who was fairer and less influenced from the outside, more influenced from the people and from his colleagues in Congress, than my chairman.

It was in that period of time when a great amount of legislation was passed controlling the price of oil, when it was enacted. There is not any more powerful in the world than the oil lobby, and yet our chairman took the lead in 1975 in the passage of the bill which controlled the price of oil at that time, and probably saved the American people some \$60 billion over the period of time from its passage until the time that it will ultimately go out of effect. One can imagine how many chips were riding on that issue, how much pressure was placed.

I can remember the time when HARLEY STAGGERS was standing as the highest-ranking person in favor of the people's interest with respect to those issues that were before us. On the other side—and I speak it with respect to all who opposed him—was the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, most of the power in the Senate. But, one man stood up and fought for the people's rights, and ultimately won. It was almost a miracle that that success was accomplished.

The same leadership has been extended through this entire period when I have served on that committee. I have had the pleasure of being on it most of the time while he was chairman. I am sorry that I did not get it during my first term. Then, I could have said almost the whole period. But, it has been a time when one feels good because he knows that he has got a good man as his leader.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join in tribute to him today.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from West Virginia for taking this time. Very often, we

read about the greatness of a man after he has left us, but to speak of a man who has served the country, his State, and his district so greatly I think is one of the greatest honors we can bestow upon him.

It has been my privilege to serve in this House with HARLEY for the past 20 years. He has been a great friend and a great buddy. In my own problems with the Idlewild Airport, he has been a great adviser. I commend the gentleman in the well for having named a building after HARLEY STAGGERS, because I think it will not only be a monument, a memento, but I think more importantly, that as the youth of America, especially in West Virginia, grow up they will look at that building and say, "Who is HARLEY STAGGERS," 20 or 50 years from now. They will hear the story of a man born in a log cabin, of humble upbringing, who worked all his life and became chairman of a great committee of this House; who brought to this Nation much-needed, much forward-looking legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman in the well for taking this time.

Mr. Speaker, HARLEY O. STAGGERS of West Virginia, one of the most revered gentlemen ever to serve in the House of Representatives, recently announced his retirement.

HARLEY STAGGERS has brilliantly served this Nation for 32 years. In that time he has met every challenge head on with a determination not found elsewhere. I suspect that may have had something to do with his background. He was born in a log cabin in West Virginia. Prior to serving in Congress he worked in a West Virginia silk mill, an Ohio tire factory, and in the wheat-fields of the Midwest. He was a railroad brakeman, a college football coach, and a county sheriff. During World War II he served his country as a gunnery navigator with the Naval Air Corps in the Atlantic and Pacific theaters. After all, you need the tenacity of a football coach, the quick thinking of a brakeman, and the coolness of a sheriff to be the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Over the years, some of the most vital legislation for this country has had his mark on it. As chairman he often had to handle many controversial and complex issues and handled them all with great aplomb. He was a chief backer of legislation to create and improve Amtrak, to modernize railroads, to support mass transit projects, and to insure the continued safety in auto and air transportation. He has been instrumental in supporting nearly every health bill passed by Congress in the last decade, and has authored bills on such wide-ranging matters as consumer protection, pollution, broadcasting, veterans affairs, education and agriculture. His diverse knowledge on these many issues have made him a key man to consult with on legislation.

When I first came to Congress 20 years ago, one of the first men I met was HARLEY. Over the years we have become good friends and have shared many a happy moment while working in



the House. His retirement will be a great loss because men such as himself do not come along every day to serve. The man from the Mountaineer State will never really be replaced and I shall miss his presence in this Chamber. He says he wants to go back home to travel, enjoy friends, visit family and to read and write. After 32 years in Congress he certainly is entitled.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join in this tribute to my good friend—and chairman—HARLEY O. STAGGERS.

HARLEY STAGGERS has been my chairman on the Commerce Committee for many years. Let me say that no Member has ever been as privileged as I to have had such a chairman. He has always been considerate of those of us on the minority side, and he has always been extremely helpful to me as an individual.

He is a man of unquestioned ability and integrity, and I want him and the other Members of this body to know that I am grateful for the friendship and kindness he has shown me.

There is a poem which goes:

If with pleasure you are viewing  
Any work a man is doing,  
And you like him, or you love him, say it  
now!  
Don't withhold your approbation  
Till the person makes oration  
And he lies with snowy lilies o'er his  
brow . . .  
For no matter how you shout, he won't really  
care about,  
He won't know how many teardrops you have  
shed.  
More than fame and more than money  
Is the comment, kind and sunny,  
And the hearty warm approval of a friend;  
Oh! it gives to life a savor  
And strengthens those who waver  
And gives one heart and courage to the end.  
If one earns your praise—bestow it!  
If you like him—let him know it!  
Let the words of true encouragement be  
said! . . .

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we are offering these words of true encouragement to our good friend from West Virginia.

I wish for HARLEY and his wife Mary many, many years in which to enjoy their well-deserved time together.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, if I am not in good voice as I rise to make these remarks, may I say that the gentleman from West Virginia, whom we are rightly honoring, is really in a measure responsible for my problem.

Mr. Speaker, I lost my voice at a hockey game between the United States and the Soviet Union. I am afraid that I got carried away a bit in my shouting to our

players and their opponents. Why do I say the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. Speaker, is somewhat responsible for my problem?

□ 1830

Mention has been made of his great chairmanship and the things that his committee has done. I think at this moment, after the glorious thrill of victory that we all witnessed of our U.S. hockey team in that series at Lake Placid, I would be remiss indeed if I were not to rise and say this to the gentleman from West Virginia: that then and now and from the beginning of the moment when it was decided to host these games, the gentleman from West Virginia, as chairman of this committee, understood what this meant, what it could mean to America in the eyes of the world if we were to successfully conduct these winter Olympics.

I thanked the gentleman then, and I do so now, for understanding early, when, frankly, Mr. Speaker, some did not understand, the significance of these games, because not only tens of millions of people in the United States and here in North America were going to watch them but millions of people all across the world, including, I might say, the Soviet Union, who witnessed that hockey game by the millions and saw what many rightly considered one of the great hockey teams in the world defeated by a bunch of young Americans who just got fired up.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman we honor, the gentleman from West Virginia, HARLEY STAGGERS, had a large measure early on in seeing what it could mean to this country and to the world to host these games.

So I say to him again, as I have said many times, "Harley, thank you for realizing what it was about and for supporting this effort." I think my voice is about gone.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentlemen, "All America now recognizes this as having been a great achievement for this country, and God bless you."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able gentleman for yielding to me.

When the word got around that HARLEY STAGGERS was leaving this House at the end of this session, every Member of this House felt a deep sense of personal loss because he was losing a cherished friend. We also felt a keen loss because the country at a critical time in its history is being deprived of the ability, the services, and the dedication of one of the ablest Members of Congress, one who has made a brilliant and a great record in his service here in this House.

I did not know him well. I knew of HARLEY STAGGERS during the last 2 years that I was in the Senate, in 1949 and 1950. Being a Member of this House has given me the privilege of having a deep and abiding friendship with him and with his lovely wife Mary. I have been on ships with them; I have seen the character that they reflected abroad as

well as here, the character of our country and our people.

I have seen the integrity, all during the years he has been here, that HARLEY STAGGERS exemplified to his colleagues and to his fellow countrymen. I have seen him here on this floor, and from his work on his committee I saw the expression of his great ability to get legislation through—tough legislation—when he had to fight up the hill.

A friend of mine down in Florida, a turpentine fellow from west Florida who was in the State senate, said, "I was one of those men who had to fight up the hill of life with the Sun in my face." Oftentimes HARLEY STAGGERS has had to fight with the Sun in his face, as it were—the "Sun" of opposition, the "sun" of lack of understanding, and the "Sun" of some interest that was protected and that did not want to see the public interest served by the passage of legislation.

HARLEY STAGGERS has made a record here that he will always be proud of, one that will always be a monument to him as a Representative. But in addition to that, HARLEY STAGGERS has been the kind of man that you revere, the sort of a friend whom you cherish. He has been the kind of fellow who would not run out on you when the shooting started or the going got rough.

He has been the kind of man who is not lightly attached to his ideals and the principles by which he has been motivated in life. He has always been gentle and kind, but there are hoops of steel in his character and in his determination when it is formed for a good cause.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to attest to my reverence, my share of reverence, for this great man. At a time when there are some who point the finger of accusation against Members of Congress, no hand of criticism or accusation was ever aimed toward HARLEY STAGGERS. He exemplified character, he exemplified integrity, and he exemplified love of his country in his public service.

So not only will his district lose its great Representative but this country will lose an able leader, a leader who has made America bigger and better and greater because of the great service that he has performed.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to pay tribute to his wonderful wife Mary, whom so many of us know and whose friendship we also cherish. We have seen the gracious kindness she exhibits in her relations with other people; we have seen her compassion and concern for others, helping them in any way she can.

What a wonderful couple they have been. They typify the finest in family relationships. They show the character of this wonderful family in the way they manifest the religious and moral side of their lives to their friends and all who know them. What a wonderful couple they are. What wonderful people they are.

Mr. Speaker, I would say in conclusion that I would like to quote, for somebody who especially deserves it, the words that Antony delivered on the battlefield of Philippi when he came upon the fallen

body of Brutus. Looking upon his, he said:

His life was gentle, and the elements  
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up  
And say to all the world, This was a man!

Mr. Speaker, HARLEY STAGGERS is a man.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) for his wonderful words.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the word, "America," has entered frequently into the words of those who have already spoken. I think that is particularly appropriate, considering the man who is being honored in this sequence of speeches.

"America" is a word that HARLEY STAGGERS is able to use in a way that very few of us do, without self-consciousness or without apology. He has, even on those occasions when some of us have found it necessary to disagree with him, always stressed what he considered to be the interests of America and held them to be paramount.

It is interesting to this committee that the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) has headed for more than a very difficult decade may be in a sense the most American of committees. It was organized in the year 1795. It is, therefore, the oldest of the committees of the House of Representatives. It must have been the 3d or 4th Congress in which this committee was formed.

Surely in the area of the vast jurisdictions that this committee covers, particularly the regulatory scheme and the life and commerce of America, the land that HARLEY STAGGERS loves so well, no one could have been better prepared for leadership of such a committee than the man we honor, especially when we consider not just his beginnings but his nature, his adult life, and the variety of skills that he has mastered. He has been a teacher, a football coach, and a locomotive fireman. He was a county sheriff.

When we consider that all this occurred more than 32 years ago, when he assumed the mantle of a Member of the U.S. Congress, with the great breadth of subject matter that he has covered both as a Member and finally as chairman of this great committee, we find that the words of even the gifted Members who have addressed us already are hardly equal to the occasion.

□ 1840

I think that, despite all of these points to be made about HARLEY STAGGERS, the thing that I will remember about him the longest will be his absolute fairness. Sure, he is a man of passion, a man who, to his credit, can get worked up about an issue that he considers important. And sometimes he had what we might call a fast gavel. But on those rare occasions when he used a fast gavel, he was always the first one to come to you and confess that he had used a fast gavel and, on occasion, to make acknowledgment publicly.

I just tell you that those of us who have served happily on his committee for so long are going to wait a long time to find another man like HARLEY STAGGERS.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) for taking this special order.

I have noted the eloquence of the speakers who have preceded me, and I wish to associate myself with all of their very accurate and generous remarks about my chairman, HARLEY STAGGERS.

I would like simply to add that as a new Member, coming here in 1975, I found that the chairman of my full committee, HARLEY STAGGERS, was unfailingly helpful to me, willing to meet with new Members, to teach them the process, willing to talk with them about their concerns and their ideas, willing to attempt to conduct the legislative process so that every member of the committee, regardless of how senior or junior that member might be, had a full opportunity to participate in the deliberations of the committee and in the strategy sessions relating to the committee's work and the very important issues that we dealt with in the years that I have had the privilege of serving on the committee chaired by Mr. STAGGERS.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. STAGGERS is a man who cares a great deal about this country, and he has shown it over many more years than I have known him. But I wanted to join in this tribute to his patriotism, to his leadership and to his willingness to help younger people learn the ropes of Congress and participate fully in the process of democracy in our country.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues in praising the career and the work of Chairman STAGGERS.

It is difficult to add to the things that have been said. I know Chairman STAGGERS from long hours of hard energy conference committees where he showed strong and able leadership and where there, as everywhere, he always advocated that we try to do what is right for this country, what is right for the future of this country.

One story comes to mind about him. When he was in the subway, returning from one of those busy conferences, going back to the Rayburn Building, there was a group of sixth graders from somewhere else in the country, they were not from West Virginia, and one of the guards pointed out that "There is a chairman of the House of Representatives." And Chairman STAGGERS went over to this group of sixth graders and he spoke to them about how much he believed in this country, about how much

he believed in their future, what they could do to become good citizens.

The one enduring thing that HARLEY STAGGERS has contributed by example, and which he was contributing to these young people in education, is what ultimately counts is the character of the individual. That was his message to these sixth graders. He took time from his busy schedule, as he must have done many, many times in his career to make sure that those critical values, the critical appreciation of the character of an individual, was communicated and fostered in this country. I think he deserves our praise and our respect, and I am sure he will be long remembered in this Chamber after he has retired. Hopefully he is going to be back here any number of times to visit with us and to offer his advice and insight as an outsider after his many, many years of being an insider.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCCLORY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I never had the privilege of serving on the committee chaired by the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), who has announced his retirement, but I could not be here on the floor on this occasion while tributes were being paid to him without expressing my own feelings of friendship and respect and affection for HARLEY STAGGERS.

I have observed him here on the floor many times in the presentation of legislation in a very genuine and in a very straightforward way. He has taken a lot of gaff, he has taken a lot of harsh treatment here on the floor from time to time, but he has stood his ground and he has comported himself with great dignity, with qualities of statesmanship and leadership which deserve the respect and the admiration of all of the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that my experience here in Washington has brought me in much closer contact with his beloved State of West Virginia, and I have had occasion to visit in his congressional district a number of times and to realize what a great constituency he has and to learn about the great affection in which they hold their distinguished Member of this House of Representatives, HARLEY STAGGERS.

So it is really with pride that I point to him as a friend and a colleague, and it is an honor to be part of a body which is served so ably by HARLEY STAGGERS and to take this occasion to express to him my warm and sincere friendship and my good wishes for the active life that I know he is going to pursue in the years ahead.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.



Mr. LUKEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, along with the other Members of this House, and especially those of us on the Commerce Committee, I felt a certain sense of disappointment, even shock, at the thought of the House of Representatives without HARLEY STAGGERS, and the thought of the Commerce Committee without HARLEY STAGGERS, so I join in this chorus of praise which is richly deserved, which has been warmly earned throughout the years of his association with all of us.

We can say about few people in this world that "He is really one of the nice guys, one about whom we have a difficult time finding fault." So it is a pleasure to celebrate on this occasion, to celebrate his virtues, to celebrate our association with this gentleman who, although there is not that great difference of years, I think many of us looked upon HARLEY in a fatherly way because he was always kindly, wise, an adviser and a counselor at all times. Fairness has been attributed to him, and he richly deserves that accolade. But he was never sharp and never unfair. With many people there are certain words or certain phrases that we associate with them. Some of us like to say that we want to be fair, we want to exercise morality or principle, or in some other way describe a certain standard. HARLEY always said, "If it is good for America, then I am for it." And we knew that HARLEY STAGGERS was not flag-waving, but he was just telling us that he believes in society, he believes in this House of Representatives and in this Congress, and by that standard, if it is good for America, if it is fair and right, it is HARLEY STAGGERS.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, all of us who have served with HARLEY STAGGERS on the Commerce Committee know and respect him as one of the finest men who ever served in the Halls of Congress. The first words that come to my mind are, "He is a great Christian man."

In this day when America's needs are so strong for a return to religion, we are most thankful that we have had man of his warm, gentle and sincere character serving with us. HARLEY lives the Christian spirit.

As a chairman, he was fair and always provided equity for the minority. As a chairman, he would expedite legislation no matter how hard the members might fight to delay the bill. He knew how to stay behind his bills until they were clean bills. But what impressed us on the Commerce Committee so much was that when a bill from our committee went to the floor, it was in good legislative shape. Our bills could be amended, but they were probably going to pass when they went to the House Floor.

HARLEY has a lovely family. I know of no one who is prouder of their family and their achievements than HARLEY. He has raised lawyers and doctors to carry on in the fine tradition that he has established.

West Virginia takes great pride in HARLEY STAGGERS who has served so long and so well as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am honored that I had the opportunity to serve under Chairman HARLEY STAGGERS.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his comments.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

□ 1850

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I thank my colleague for yielding. For 16 years I have been HARLEY STAGGERS' colleague on the Committee on Commerce, and, of course, through all of the time that he has been chairman of that committee I have also served as a subcommittee chairman under his leadership.

I would like to pay tribute to Chairman STAGGERS as one of the most outstanding chairmen in the history of the U.S. Congress, as chairman of a committee that has legislative jurisdiction for about half of the activities that the House and, of course, the Congress must deal with.

His leadership in the field of energy, transportation, communication, public health, commerce, finance, the entire oversight and investigations of all of our regulatory bodies has been fulfilled over these many years with absolute integrity, and he has distinguished himself and he has brought tremendous credit to his family, to his district, to this Congress and to the Nation.

I might say that while he was accomplishing all of these major national leadership accomplishments, he was not forgetting his district back in West Virginia. Any time we had a railroad bill, we had the private HARLEY STAGGERS West Virginia railroad written into it. Whenever we had an energy bill, the coal fields and the natural gas fields of West Virginia were first and foremost and always continued the process from committee through floor action and, of course, with the great survivors in the conference. HARLEY never lost his sense of humor notwithstanding the fact that there were some slight philosophical differences in the committee, whether they went to politics or whether they went to staffing of various subcommittees or what the give and take was in the political process as we know it.

Within the Democratic caucus of that committee, every member of the committee, every member of the staff, considered HARLEY STAGGERS his close personal friend and admired him to the utmost.

He had our complete respect, and from every man in the minority, we know from their activities, he had their total support.

We are going to miss HARLEY STAGGERS. It is not going to be the same around here. We are not going to have that

West Virginia orientation to the legislation that we do. We are not going to have that total fairness. I am sure his successors will be fair, but with HARLEY it was a fairness and protection for Members when they could not be physically present in a committee because of other responsibilities.

He always preserved their rights and reserved their rights and in many instances voted their proxy for them and, of course, made the statements that protected them in their districts and also in the areas of their endeavors here in the Congress.

HARLEY, we will miss you as a friend. We will miss you as a legislator, but we will always cherish the memories of your accomplishments to this country.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PREYER. I think Chairman STAGGERS sitting here listening to all of the things said about him must now appreciate how a pancake feels after all the syrup has been poured over it, but I do want to join in the chorus of praise for Chairman STAGGERS.

I have served on his committee since I have been in Congress. He has been my chairman all of that time, and I want to attest to his unfailing courtesy and fairness, to all of the members of his committee.

He is certainly one of nature's gentlemen.

I think it was Emerson who said that sometimes a recital of a man's accomplishments and his deeds would fall very short of the measure of the man himself, because as Emerson put it, you did not get the weight of the man from just reading his speeches or from a recital of his deeds. Mr. Emerson cited George Washington as an example of that.

Well, I think that Chairman STAGGERS is that kind of man that you cannot describe the weight of Mr. STAGGERS and his influence very well in words or in terms of speeches or accomplishments, but that weight, his influence, went well beyond that, and it came from things hard to put into words like character and integrity and fairness and compassion.

The influence of that kind of man will live on a long time after he is gone.

I, too, want to, as the gentleman from Texas praised Mr. STAGGERS' family life, and I do not know of his family, but I particularly want to pay tribute to Mrs. Stagg.

They say that behind every great man there stands a woman telling him he is wrong.

Well, I am sure Mrs. Stagg would tell him he was wrong in a very kindly way, but I know her contribution to his success has been something else that has been very hard to measure.

We wish both of them a very long and happy life and thank them for all they have done for the United States of America.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a great deal of sadness to bid formal, but not final farewell to a distinguished chairman of a great committee, one of the finest men who has ever served in this body, a man respected for his ability and for his dedication to the public interest.

One of the things I have always observed about HARLEY STAGGERS was he was internally directed. He had lodestar. He knew where he was going. His test was what is good for America. All of us here have heard him use those words many times on the House floor.

But HARLEY kept before him his judgment as to what was good for the people, and not just the people of West Virginia, but the people everywhere in this country.

His leadership on the committee has indeed been inspired, and during that time, as has been pointed out, he has enjoyed the love and affection and respect and great companionship of his wonderful wife, Mary, who gave him richness and strength in his life.

He has also raised a fine family who do him great credit and of whom I am sure he is properly proud.

The legislation of the Committee on Commerce has not been easy. It has been one of the committees which has carried one of the heaviest jurisdictional loads in this body, but also been a committee where some of the most difficult issues were laid before it, such as energy, health, pollution, environment, communications, the markets and finance, transportation, and an abundance of matter relating to the every day well being of the people of this country.

In all those difficult matters HARLEY has provided not only unfailing leadership but remarkable good humor, and I speak as one who has known him both as friend and ally and oftentimes as adversaries when we had differences over matters of policy, but in all occasions, HARLEY has fought these fights, whether he was friend or adversary, in these matters as a man of not only unfailing good humor, but of extraordinary integrity and great decency.

The House can be proud of HARLEY STAGGERS and his service here. The House is going to regret and grieve his departure.

The House is going to rejoice at the friendship which we have all shared with HARLEY over the years and the kindnesses and the friendships that we have known in our associations with him.

All of us are going to look with hope that we will see him from time to time or that we might see another HARLEY STAGGERS in this place at some time in the future. All of us are going to look with hope that we will have the privilege and pleasure of visiting with him from time to time, and all of us are going to look with hope that he will have a long life to enjoy his family, his friends, his

wonderful wife, and enjoy the privilege of living in the great State he loves so well and that he has served so well.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. I have been very impressed as I have sat here listening to the tributes paid to our chairman, HARLEY STAGGERS, by the eloquence and articulateness of those who have paid tribute to this fine man. I feel so inadequate to the task of adding my own personal sense of loss at his leaving the Congress and the post of chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as the committee that I serve on with Chairman STAGGERS.

His loss is a personal loss that I will feel, because he has been a friend to me and a mentor and an inspiration.

In every issue that has come before us, the question that he has asked is whether this is good for America, whether it is good for the people of this country, and his clear sense of populism, distrust of those special interests that are ready to take advantage of the poor and the defenseless among us in this society and his willingness to move in a compassionate and humanitarian way for the benefit of all people stands as an inspiration for all of us who are following in his path and serving on that committee.

□ 1900

He leaves a legacy of 32 years of public service in the House of Representatives and deserves as much credit as any man who has served in this House for passing so much legislation of so much importance to so many in the fields particularly of energy, transportation and health communications; all those important matters which are now within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

It is a sense of loss that I want to express for the people of this country who are losing a fine and outstanding public servant and it is a sense of loss I feel myself in losing as a colleague a friend, but while I may lose him as a colleague, I hope I will always continue to call him a friend.

Mr. Speaker, when HARLEY STAGGERS retires at the end of the 96th Congress, he will leave a legacy of 32 years of service to the people of West Virginia and the Nation. Few who have ever served in the House can take as much credit as HARLEY deserves for passing so much legislation of such importance to so many.

Under his tenure as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a position he has held for 14 years, our laws on energy, health, environment, transportation, and consumer protection were completely refashioned to meet the dynamic needs of the post-war generation. The issues have been terribly difficult, the process often tumultuous, the conflicting pressures frustrating—but HARLEY was able again and again to forge the consensus necessary

for Congress to meet the expectations placed upon us. HARLEY never failed the challenge.

HARLEY STAGGERS has been my chairman from my first days in Congress in 1975. He has always been fair, always responsive to the views of every member of the committee. I know him best as a man of tremendous personal sensitivity and commitment to the common men and women of America. What HARLEY wants to know when a bill is before our committee is: What will this mean for average citizens? Will it help them or not? Will it improve their lives? Will it protect them from the selfish desires of special interests? It was this determination never to forget his roots—to remain honest to his populist convictions—which made HARLEY so respected at home and such a fine leader in the House.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, I have always had HARLEY's support in pressing for the most progressive legislation. He has been a true friend, and I am grateful to have been able to work with him and to learn from him.

I want to wish HARLEY, his wonderful wife Mary, and their family the very best in the future.

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, Congressman HARLEY O. STAGGERS leaves the House of Representatives at the end of this term after 32 years of service. He leaves behind a reputation of a fine and good man. During his years of public service Mr. STAGGERS has represented his West Virginia constituency well. No other district has been served more honorably. A loyal person, he is true to both his beliefs and friends. He knows what too many have not learned, to get loyalty one must give loyalty.

As chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee he has accomplished many goals. The committee has wide and varied jurisdiction. His steady hand has guided us in such matters as health, energy, the environment and consumer affairs. There is probably no other Member of Congress who has worked more diligently toward preserving and improving our Nation's rail system. He has conscientiously worked toward the betterment of our national rail passenger system. His understanding of the energy crisis presently facing our Nation reinforced his dedication to providing a safe and efficient Amtrak system.

Coupled with that goal, was a strong sense of responsibility to the working man. America's labor force could have no better representative. He has been consistent in his belief that labor is the backbone of America. On their behalf, he has worked to improve working conditions, benefits and insure the safety of all railroad employees. Rail safety has been a top priority with Mr. STAGGERS.

Over the past year as chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Commerce, I have learned much from Chairman STAGGERS. I appreciate the di-



rection and cooperation he has extended me. In his future endeavors, I wish him much success.

● **Mr. BRADEMAS.** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this tribute to Chairman HARLEY STAGGERS, who has announced his plan to retire to pursue other interests and care for his health at the end of this Congress.

It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that Chairman STAGGERS' decision took his constituents by surprise. He has served them well during 32 years in Congress, a West Virginia record for consecutive years, and has been a political institution in his State.

Harry Truman was President when HARLEY STAGGERS was first elected to the House, and in 16 elections there has only been one time, in the memory of veteran West Virginia observers, that an opponent has even come close to upsetting him.

HARLEY STAGGERS is one of the last current Members of Congress to be born in a log cabin. He has taught school, worked in a factory, coached football, and worked as a railroad brakeman. No doubt this experience has helped Chairman STAGGERS become one of the most sensitive, hard-working, and influential chairmen in Congress.

As chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which he has served since 1951 and which he has headed for 15 years, HARLEY STAGGERS has shown outstanding leadership in handling the varied and complex issues which fall within the committee's jurisdiction—issues ranging from the quality of health research to the future role of railroads in our society. Further, for 22 years Chairman STAGGERS served his colleagues as an assistant Democratic whip, and those of us who now toil in that vineyard salute his efforts there.

Mr. Speaker, all of us will miss HARLEY STAGGERS. He is a man of uncommon decency and kindness. He has been a genuine servant of the people of his State and of our country.

I wish HARLEY and his wife, Mary, only the best in whatever they now decide to do.

● **Mr. RHODES.** Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the House today to recognize the contributions to this body and our Nation of a man who has served in the House for 32 years, HARLEY O. STAGGERS.

He has represented the Second District of West Virginia since 1949, and has played a major role in major transportation reforms, under the auspices of his chairmanship of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has been a prime mover in the Federal program to rejuvenate the Nation's railroad systems, which will be increasingly important as our Nation adjusts to the prospect of higher energy costs and possible restrictions on the use of petroleum over the years ahead.

I have served with HARLEY STAGGERS during most of his tenure in the Congress, and I enjoy and value his friendship.

I congratulate him on his years of outstanding service, and join my col-

leagues in wishing him a well-earned, enjoyable retirement.

● **Mr. WIRTH.** Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my deep appreciation and that of the people of the Second District of Colorado to Congressman HARLEY O. STAGGERS of West Virginia, for his dedicated service to our Nation during the past three decades. His efforts on behalf of the citizens of West Virginia and the United States have been significant and salutary.

HARLEY's interest and efforts regarding health issues facing the American people have been inspirational. As a principal sponsor of nearly every health bill passed during the past 10 years, HARLEY STAGGERS has helped improve both the knowledge about and the ability of many to cope with debilitating illnesses. His influence has often been the catalyst which has supplied hope to America's sick and infirm.

HARLEY has also played a key role in solving many of our Nation's transportation and energy problems during his tenure in office. His promotion of mass transportation projects, modernization of railroads and Amtrak, and his interest in upgrading automobile and air safety programs have proven to be important steps in maintaining a healthy transportation industry in these times of essential energy conservation.

In sum, the "Dean of the West Virginia Congressional Delegation" will be missed both personally and professionally. As chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, HARLEY has provided the leadership necessary to implement a variety of programs for the betterment of our society. As a member of the Commerce Committee, I can personally testify to the leadership the chairman has shown, and to the help, friendship, and inspiration he has given me and other younger Members. I am grateful for having served on the committee under HARLEY STAGGERS. We will all miss him.

● **Mr. JONES of Tennessee.** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in special tribute to Chairman HARLEY STAGGERS. I have considered Mr. STAGGERS an effective representative of his district in West Virginia and more importantly my friend since my election to this body 11 years ago.

It has been through his committee that some of the most important legislation of the past decade has come. It has been his leadership, patience, and persistence that has contributed so significantly to the development of that legislation. He has borne up well under the tremendous pressures of being chairman of one of this body's most important committees.

It has been my pleasure to have known HARLEY STAGGERS and served with him in this House. His 32 years in the service of his country have been productive, constructive, and successful. I want to express to him my admiration for his work, my regret that he is leaving us, and my sincerest wish that he enjoy a happy and well-deserved retirement.

● **Mr. BROOKS.** Mr. Speaker, the people of West Virginia showed much wisdom when they sent HARLEY STAGGERS

to Washington in 1948. They could not have picked a more conscientious Congressman and he has served his district, State, and Nation in a most responsible and able manner.

To list the accomplishments made by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the 14 years that HARLEY has served as chairman would be nearly impossible. As chairman, he can take pride in the outstanding leadership he has brought to this all-important post. His retirement should come with the knowledge that his efforts, talents, and devoted service have most certainly been appreciated.

I would like to congratulate you, HARLEY, on a distinguished career—you will be greatly missed as you take these next years to spend more time with your fine family and those grandchildren.

● **Mr. CONTE.** Mr. Speaker, when a great American announces his intention to retire from this House, it is timely for us to reflect on the effects of his service here.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS has decided to leave us at the end of this term. He has had a truly remarkable career in the House of Representatives—a career that has spanned the transformation of this Nation after World War II, the development of the nuclear age, the greening of the Nation, and the current reaffirmation of our national purpose and values. HARLEY STAGGERS has served diligently, honorably, and wisely. Such an evaluation of service should be all that a Congressman would ever need as a tribute.

But HARLEY STAGGERS has been more to this House than a staunch patriot, faithful servant, and able representative of the mountain State of West Virginia. The major issues that have come before his Commerce Committee have been the issues that determine the fate of this Nation—energy, commerce, transportation, health, communications, and consumer protection. The forging of a consensus on such issues is a most difficult task, but during HARLEY's stewardship we have seen the enactment of workable, commonsense legislation that has served and is serving to shape a national plan.

HARLEY, with 32 years of outstanding service in the House behind him, has certainly earned the right to a more constant enjoyment of the beautiful and bountiful eastern panhandle of West Virginia. While my First Congressional District of Massachusetts is certainly resplendent in natural beauty, HARLEY's land of Harper's Ferry, national and State forests, and the New River is lovely territory as well. In fact, his whole district is a wild, wonderful park to itself—indeed almost heaven.

The challenges of HARLEY's First District of West Virginia are the challenges that face the Nation. His district has the coal and lumber this Nation needs for its commerce; it has the marriage of nature and mankind that points the way to our survival on this planet; and it has the beauty and history that we can enjoy in our leisure. But most of all it has the spirit of freedom and independence that has been the American watchword. "Mountaineers are always free" is the motto of the State of West Virginia—and HARLEY STAGGERS has lived this motto. He

has touched all bases—as an educator, an athlete, a military man, a politician, a family man, and a dear friend to his constituents.

HARLEY has used his talents to chart this Nation's course in the 20th century. Let us hope that in this House, others will follow HARLEY's example and bring the spirit that comes from his native State—that all Americans, like his mountaineers, are always free.●

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, a fine and gentle man announced his retirement last week. HARLEY O. STAGGERS has served in this institution since 1948, and he has upheld the standard of decency and a commitment to excellence unparalleled in Congress. He is an unabashed defender of the public interest and he has a great love and faith in the American people. It is an honor for me to pay tribute to my friend and colleague.

As chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee over the last 14 years, he helped mold and shepherd through Congress some of the most important pieces of domestic legislation ever enacted by Congress. The Amtrak Act, the National Heart, Lung, and Stroke Act, the Cancer Attack Act, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting Act, the Clean Air Act, the National Energy Act are just a handful of measures on which he has played an integral role. Every American has in some way been touched by legislation emanating from the Commerce Committee under his stewardship.

As a second-term member on the Commerce Committee, I have grown to respect his judgment and value his counsel. As chairman, he was even-handed, fair, and went out of his way to encourage ideas and gain input from all members. HARLEY STAGGERS has had an important influence on my life and I will always be grateful for his help and his guidance.

After 40 years in public service, 32 years in Congress, and 14 years as chairman of the Commerce Committee, HARLEY STAGGERS will be leaving to pursue a new career. He leaves a rich legacy of accomplishments and a great many friends and admirers. His commitment to the public interest and his leadership will be missed but HARLEY STAGGERS will not soon be forgotten. I wish him the best of luck for a happy retirement.●

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to salute Congressman HARLEY STAGGERS, who will be missed enormously here in the House of Representatives.

Congressman STAGGERS has devoted himself with total selflessness since he was first elected to the 81st Congress on November 2, 1948.

Mr. STAGGERS has endeared himself to all of his colleagues in the House because of the unassuming and lovable way in which he has invested himself. It is impossible not to admire and have affection for this man.

His accomplishments are legion and legendary. I send to HARLEY and to his dear wife, Mary, and their children, my thanks for having allowed Congress and the country to have so much of their husband and father during the past 30 years. His contributions to our country

will be remembered by all of those in the Congress who will seek to emulate in some small way his virtues and accomplishments.●

● Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, during more than 20 years in the House of Representatives it has been my privilege to serve as a colleague of Congressman HARLEY STAGGERS in the West Virginia delegation. I learned of his announced retirement with regret, but I believe none among us has more certainly earned the right to return to private life at a time of our own choice.

Here is a man of whom it can be said that he gave all of the best years of his life to the public service. In war and peace, in cold war and détente, in recession and inflation, he did his duty as a soldier in the trenches of the legislative process. Over a span of 30 years there was never a suggestion that his official actions were taken with anything in mind but adherence to the highest ethical standards required of a public official. Those who claim to have lost faith in the credibility of the Congress and the caliber of its Members would find a study of his career instructive, because it stands as a model of how we must perform our duties while remaining aloof from specialized pressures.

Throughout his career, HARLEY STAGGERS has been ever mindful of "the people back home." Serving the largest geographical district east of the Mississippi, he was required to understand the needs and convictions of a composite population scattered among cities, small towns and remote mountain rural areas. They held the rights to representation in Congress which reflected their views, and he held the responsibility to see that their views were considered in the proper quarters.

It was a task to discourage and defeat a less determined man, but the duty was done gracefully and effectively down through the years by HARLEY STAGGERS. Because he held the conviction that what was good for "the people back home" was good for the country, the same philosophy that convinced the Constitutional Convention of 1787 of the need for a House of Representatives elected directly by the people every 2 years.

Thinking back over the past 20 years, I am drawn to parallel his congressional career with the spirit expressed by the motto of West Point—"duty, honor, country." These words have had special meaning for thousands of Americans who committed their lives to the upholding of a tradition of honorable service. They describe the career of HARLEY STAGGERS, and he has added his own portion to the luster those words have gained through the work and sacrifice of thousands of Americans who have gone before us.

My best wishes go with him into retirement, and I am hopeful it will be a time as described by Gen. Douglas MacArthur in his farewell address to the West Point cadets—a time of "wonderous beauty, coaxed and caressed by the smiles of yesterday."●

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in

honoring our illustrious colleague, HARLEY STAGGERS, a legislator par excellence. HARLEY STAGGERS' concern has been his fellow Americans. Having served his country for 32 years by watching over the laws that protect his fellow countrymen, HARLEY STAGGERS has protected America's poor, helped feed its hungry, nursed its ill and listened to the cries of its distressed.

HARLEY STAGGERS has been the protector of perhaps America's most overlooked, vulnerable citizens: The people of Appalachia. Mr. STAGGERS has let no one tread on them. He has been a principal sponsor of nearly every health bill passed by Congress, including the Cancer Attack Act, the Emergency Medical Services Act, and the Heart, Lung and Stroke Act. Undoubtedly, his foremost contribution to the people of Appalachia has been his work to provide the remedies that cure their illnesses.

His work in the field of health is an important branch of the tree of his legislation, but not his only one. HARLEY STAGGERS has furthered his mission by being a key representative in the field of transportation. I believe few have the right to sing: "I've been working on the railroad," with as much fervor as HARLEY STAGGERS. He realized Amtrak's potential long before many others did.

HARLEY STAGGERS has been a complete Congressman. Such has been his legacy to this institution that I urge my colleagues to be advocates of the HARLEY STAGGERS doctrine which states that a society that cares for itself and desires to care for its people, must be cared for first.

HARLEY STAGGERS: An unabashed patriot whose fraternal presence shall forever grace this House.●

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable HARLEY STAGGERS of West Virginia. Mr. STAGGERS has of course announced that he will not seek election to the 97th Congress, and it is with a sense of imminent loss that his colleagues view this declaration.

HARLEY STAGGERS has for the last 32 years more than ably served the residents of West Virginia's Second District. Moreover, he has been in the forefront of many pieces of landmark legislation which have had a profound impact on the lives of all Americans.

As the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce since 1966, Mr. STAGGERS has served the interests of the members of that committee and of the House by combining even-handedness with a strong sense of our national destiny. His work on consumer, energy, health, transportation, environment and communications issues has earned Chairman STAGGERS the reputation as a determined fighter for the average American. HARLEY STAGGERS will be sorely missed in Congress and I know that all of my colleagues join me in thanking him for his contributions to the well-being of the United States.●

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, I frankly do not know too many people who were born in a log cabin. In fact, Representa-



tive HARLEY STAGGERS may be the only one of my personal acquaintance who shares with President Lincoln this well-loved American vision of an ascent from wooden walls to marble floors.

It is a well-loved story to us because we believe in dreams and because we ask of our Presidents, our Congressmen, our leaders, that in this democracy they indeed remain aware of the "demos," of the people. And if they themselves sprung from what is viewed as a rustic and simple life to a position of power, perhaps it will be easier for them not to forget, to "get above their raisin," when they reach the halls of power.

I think in the finest of American and democratic traditions, Chairman STAGGERS has served the people for over 30 years. He never forgot them and often, so often, it was he that reminded us that the actions we take here have real consequences for real people. If we became lost in the rhetoric, the grand design of our programs, it was HARLEY who could bring us back to the task at hand. He would remind us to ask of ourselves how what we were doing would effect the people, and was it in their best interest?

I was honored to be able to serve under Chairman STAGGERS in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and I know that he extended this consideration of people's needs into the committee room—he was fair in sharing the work of the committee, in allowing those who wanted to speak to do so without being gavelled into silence. He did not stifle full and lively discussions.

We are all going to miss HARLEY here. He has served with commitment to his district and to the country since 1948. It is time he got to enjoy those West Virginia mountains and to relax a little. I wish him all the best.●

● Mr. GRAMM. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in lamenting the retirement of Chairman HARLEY O. STAGGERS and in praising his dedication and his service to this House and to the Nation.

Under his leadership, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has grown in stature and influence. It has been a privilege and a singular honor for me to serve on that committee under Chairman STAGGERS' guidance.

As a freshman Member who came to the committee eager and with much to learn, I have benefited a great deal from his counsel and from the fair and even-handed manner in which he directed the committee's work. His obvious desire to include the new members in the deliberations of the committee was a source of encouragement that enhanced our learning process.

I will miss him. His experience and leadership have been a source of strength to the committee and its members. His friendship has been a blessing. Our admiration and our best wishes go with him.●

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, after over 40 years of public service, our respected colleague, HARLEY STAGGERS, has announced that he will retire at the end of the session. His distinguished record of service, both as a Representative of West Virginia and as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Com-

mittee, cannot be duplicated and his influence in the House of Representatives will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, when I think of HARLEY STAGGERS, I think of a compassionate man. It is not an easy task to guide a committee with jurisdiction over such diverse issues as railroads, health care, and communications. Nor is it easy to bring together members with such divergent views on how those issues should be addressed. Despite his own personal feelings, Chairman STAGGERS has a genuine feel for people and their needs and this has been reflected in his willingness to accommodate the wishes of committee members on both sides of the aisle.

As just one tribute to HARLEY STAGGERS' exemplary record as Commerce Committee chairman, I would like to point out that more public health legislation has been enacted during his 14-year tenure as chairman than in any other period in recent memory. This is but one example from a list which goes on and on.

HARLEY STAGGERS has spent a lifetime devoting himself to the needs of others, never pursuing those goals for personal reward. With the pressures of a hectic schedule lifted, I hope that he and his family will be able to reap the benefits of that career, benefits he so richly deserves.●

● Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my personal tribute to HARLEY STAGGERS, our distinguished colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS is approaching the end of his congressional career, and this career has been a most distinguished one.

I have known Chairman STAGGERS for about 18 years. He is a fine, wonderful man. I know of his concern and love for his family, and it is obvious that he must have the same kind of sincere thoughts about the people he represents in West Virginia because they have so regularly returned him to the Congress.

Here in the Congress, he has served as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and as head of this committee he has compiled an outstanding record of accomplishment—not just for the committee but for the Nation as a whole. His role in the solution of our energy problems and transportation problems has been a significant one.

As he voluntarily steps aside into retirement, I want to say to him: "Well done, HARLEY STAGGERS. You have been a true and faithful public servant and a gallant leader. May the years ahead see you and your family healthy and happy. And may you have lots of time to enjoy it all."●

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, who is retiring at the end of the 96th Congress after over three decades in the House of Representatives, and 15 years as chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

HARLEY STAGGERS has given 32 years of dedicated and devoted service to his constituents of the Second District of West Virginia, and has compiled a splendid record of achievement during his distinguished career. Only two other Mem-

bers in the 96th Congress have served more years in the House of Representatives.

Chairman STAGGERS' diligent efforts as chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have been both fruitful and beneficial to the citizens of this Nation, and indeed, these successful efforts have made America a more prosperous and productive country.

Few men have given more of themselves to good government, or have a more compassionate understanding of human problems than has HARLEY STAGGERS. He has been in the forefront of efforts to implement meaningful solutions and effective action on behalf of all Americans.

HARLEY is a fine legislator and a distinguished leader, and he will be missed by both his constituents and his colleagues.

I extend to HARLEY STAGGERS my best wishes for a healthy and happy retirement.●

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying a much-deserved tribute to my good friend from West Virginia, the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, HARLEY STAGGERS.

HARLEY STAGGERS and I came to Congress together in 1949, and throughout our careers I have always been able to look to this decent man for his good sense and his great compassion for the needs of America's working men and women.

Mr. Speaker, HARLEY STAGGERS' career is one of outstanding service to the citizens of his State and to his country. He enlisted in the U.S. Naval Air Corps in 1941, serving as a gunnery navigator in the Atlantic and Pacific Theaters during World War II. His record in Congress is one of constant attention and responsiveness to the concerns of the citizens of West Virginia and a true commitment to the national interest.

As chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee since 1966, HARLEY STAGGERS has steered through the Congress numerous pieces of legislation that have been crucially important to America's workers and consumers. His achievements have touched broadly in the areas of improving health care, transportation, communications, and energy policy as well as protecting the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to thank HARLEY STAGGERS for his friendship and his many contributions to this House. I wish him all the best in his retirement.●

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of our finest colleagues, Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS. The chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee since 1965, he has spent 44 years in public service. Born in a log cabin, he worked as a railroad brakeman, a high school and college educator, and as a sheriff, before being elected to the House of Representatives.

The Commerce Committee has one of the largest, most sprawling jurisdictions of all the House committees. Chairman STAGGERS, by allowing the experts to make

their contributions, and by allowing a considerable amount of freedom to his subcommittee chairmen, helped the committee to do its work more effectively. The House has undergone tremendous changes in the past 15 years, especially in the way its committees are handled and the role that they play. Chairman STAGGERS has played a positive role in helping the Commerce Committee move smoothly and efficiently through this period of change.

One specific area in which the committee has had an impact during his tenure is that of railroads. The railroads were in a marked period of decline when HARLEY STAGGERS took over the chairmanship. Since then, they have made great progress and are again contributing much to the commerce of America.

Unfortunately, Representative STAGGERS has decided to return to private life at the end of this Congress. West Virginia, as well as the Nation, will be losing a fine Representative. Both my wife Lee and I, wish HARLEY, his wife Mary, and their six children, the best in the years ahead.●

● Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that I learned that Representative HARLEY STAGGERS of West Virginia was retiring. He has served this institution long—32 years. He has served it honorably.

As chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, he has been deeply involved in many critical legislative matters through the years. Most everything which concerns the movement of commerce in this country has gone through his committee. His work and the work of his committee is and are of fundamental importance in the functioning of our Federal system. Indeed, the principal action which the framers of the Constitution took in altering the Articles of Confederation under which our Nation was first governed was to provide the Federal Government with supreme authority over goods and commodities in commerce. With such authority the economic integration of our Federal union was permitted to develop and blossom, thus permitting our Nation to succeed with a viable unit of government. It can thus be rightfully argued that HARLEY STAGGERS has chaired that committee whose work and jurisdiction has been critical to a strong America and to a continuing strong America.

A Member who has been here in this Chamber since 1948 has had the opportunity to see our Nation and the world change firsthand. Perhaps with this opportunity one concludes that the more things change the more they stay the same. Perhaps. But, in my 10 fewer years here I have come to realize that this body is an inherently human institution where each and every Member is different and adds their own individual strengths to the whole. There is no question but that after 32 years of service that any Member who then retires will be missed. There is also no question that in the case of HARLEY STAGGERS—the honorable gentleman from West Virginia—that the person will be greatly missed.

Good luck to you HARLEY.●

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, Roll Call refers to its listing of Members retiring and seeking other office as the "Casualty List." In the case of our colleague, HARLEY STAGGERS, it will indeed be a casualty to the Congress and the American people to lose his dedicated service. For 32 years he has toiled in the House of Representatives on behalf of the people of West Virginia and for the last 15 years he has toiled as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

In a sense HARLEY STAGGERS has devoted his entire working life to public service having served as a football coach and sheriff prior to being elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. And if there is one trait for which HARLEY shall be long remembered during these many years of public service it is fairness.

Mr. Speaker, HARLEY and I did not always agree on the specific points of legislation he handled on the House floor, but I shall always appreciate his fairness to the other Members and being "up front" with them on controversial issues.

As much as we hate to see HARLEY retire at the end of this year, we all realize that it will be a well-deserved retirement and that he can look back on his years of dedicated service with pride and satisfaction. We all wish him happiness and good health in the years to come.●

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in saluting the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, HARLEY STAGGERS.

For over 44 years, HARLEY STAGGERS has dedicated himself to serving the people of West Virginia and the entire Nation. As a Member of the House of Representatives for the past 32 years, he has fought tirelessly to protect the American laborer. His efforts in behalf of our Nation's coal miners, a long oppressed group, are just one example. His understanding of the problems confronting the workingman is perhaps attributable to his own experience as a railroad brakeman before his entry into public life. Because of his compassion and deep sense of duty, he has never lost that understanding. He has the gratitude of millions of American workers.

As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the past 14 years, HARLEY STAGGERS has demonstrated the open-mindedness and leadership which make the Congress the great institution it is. He has done much to preserve the American rail system, which is of ever-increasing importance in these times of limited energy resources. HARLEY STAGGERS' knowledge in areas such as this have been of immeasurable benefit to the economic well-being of America.

Chairman STAGGERS' retirement will be a great loss to the House of Representatives. His counsel, understanding, and leadership have been invaluable to us. I join HARLEY STAGGERS' many friends in Congress in wishing him many happy and productive years to come.●

● Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from West Virginia for taking this special order to pay

a well-deserved tribute to my friend, HARLEY STAGGERS, who plans to retire at the end of this session. HARLEY STAGGERS has enjoyed a long and distinguished political career, and he will be sorely missed in the Congress.

He is truly a man of West Virginia, a State of great beauty and hard-working men and women who represent the very backbone of America. Like the magnificent mountains that form so much of his congressional district, HARLEY STAGGERS is symbolic of a calm and steady demeanor in a world that too often resorts to confrontation and harsh rhetoric to achieve goals. He leads in a quiet and unassuming manner, and at all times is a gentleman.

When HARLEY STAGGERS replaced Judge Oren Harris as chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, he was the right man for a difficult job. As we all know, the committee rarely brings us an easy bill. It is a committee with tremendously diverse jurisdiction with membership that traditionally represents both ends of the political spectrum. Because of the great power that the committee exerts over so many areas of national endeavor, the job of chairman is not easy. It calls for a person who is willing to listen to all sides and has the ability to work a compromise that is good for the entire country, and HARLEY STAGGERS is that person.

I am going to miss HARLEY. He is a good friend, an able legislator, and a true patriot. We will all miss him, but I feel confident that the future will continue to find him involved in the growth and development of his State and Nation.●

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of HARLEY O. STAGGERS' decision to retire from the House. His incisive thinking and political courage will be sorely missed.

Elected in 1948 to the 81st Congress, HARLEY has well served his constituents of the Second Congressional District of West Virginia. It is well known that HARLEY can be counted on to help his constituents with any problem.

Since 1966, he has ably served as chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee dealing with a wide variety of tough national issues such as consumer protection, health care, and federally regulated industries.

The House will not be the same without him.●

● Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, words are not easy to find to express my feeling of regret on the decision not to seek reelection of our colleague, HARLEY O. STAGGERS.

However, I would like to reiterate some of the remarks I made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 13, when I introduced legislation to name the Federal building at Morgantown, W. Va., the "Harley O. Stagers Federal Building."

As I pointed out at that time, HARLEY's contribution to the national legislative process has been awesome. The scope of his legislative achievements during his tenure as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is difficult to comprehend. An awesome list can quickly be compiled of the many necessary and important legis-



lative measures he has sponsored and managed dealing with and directly affecting the health of our citizens, the commerce of the Nation, our transportation and communications systems, national energy policy, environmental quality, consumer protection, and hazardous substances.

He can serve as a role model for all in the conduct of our own legislative responsibilities in a successful and effective fashion.

But a particular debt of gratitude is owed to him by many of us who are actively concerned with programs developed under the tenure of Chairman STAGGERS.

While we are all sorry to see him go, his inspiration will always remain with us, as will the continuing benefit our country will derive from the contribution of HARLEY STAGGERS.●

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, when the 97th Congress convenes in 1981, for the first time in 33 years HARLEY O. STAGGERS will not be serving in the House. For that reason, our House will be the poorer.

HARLEY STAGGERS has taken the two roles of a U.S. Congressman—representative of the people and national legislator—and melded them well. As chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, HARLEY STAGGERS has had a tremendous and beneficial impact on much legislation in the fields of environmental protection, health, and, perhaps most importantly, our American railroad industry. But at the same time, he has never stopped representing the people of the Second Congressional District of West Virginia. Accordingly, next January we in Congress will miss HARLEY STAGGERS—and so will the people he has served for so long.●

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join so many of my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, who last week announced his retirement from the House of Representatives after more than three decades of service to his constituents of West Virginia's Second Congressional District, and to his country.

Mr. Speaker, HARLEY STAGGERS' distinguished career in the U.S. Congress has been equaled by few. His dedication and devotion to duty have been particularly apparent to those of us who have served with him during his chairmanship of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As chairman, HARLEY STAGGERS could always be depended upon for fairness in his decisions, honesty in his dealings with fellow committee members regardless of party, and total dedication to the task of achieving agreement on legislation under consideration by the committee. His task was not made easier by the heavy workload of controversial legislation the committee has considered in recent years.

Despite this tremendous amount of committee work, despite the weighty responsibilities of his office, HARLEY STAGGERS always maintained his sunny disposition, his gentle manner, and his ability to make friends. Few Members enjoy as wide a circle of friends from

both sides of the aisle as does HARLEY STAGGERS.

We shall miss our friend. It is difficult to imagine the House of Representatives without HARLEY STAGGERS' cheerful presence. His constituents and the Nation will miss his dedicated devotion to his lawmaking duties.

I join my colleagues in wishing HARLEY and his lovely wife Mary the most pleasant of retirement years, blessed with good health, the richness of friendships, the warmth of memories, and the satisfaction that stems from a job well done.●

● Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in honoring a great fellow Member of this body, Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS.

I became a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which HARLEY chairs, at the beginning of the 96th Congress. I had the pleasure of working closely with him on many important issues. In his long tenure as Representative from the Second Congressional District of West Virginia, Congressman STAGGERS has worked hard for his constituents and worked well with his fellow colleagues. I wish HARLEY the best that life can offer in years to come. It can be truly said that HARLEY STAGGERS is one of the great legislators of our time.●

● Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, after 44 years of distinguished public service, 32 of them served in the House of Representatives, HARLEY O. STAGGERS has decided to leave the Congress at the end of this term. I am proud to join in this tribute to the chairman of the House Commerce Committee, and to wish him many happy and productive years after his retirement.

How does one epitomize such a distinguished legislative career? Surely we must point to Chairman STAGGERS' sponsorship of wide-ranging legislation in health, railroads, and mass transit, consumer protection, energy conservation, broadcasting, and veterans' affairs. HARLEY has served as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service and Veterans' Affairs Committees, in addition to his present chairmanship of Commerce, and he has been a valuable and forceful presence in each of these capacities.

Yet HARLEY STAGGERS' impact on this body cannot be measured merely by the years of his service. His quiet and steady influence will be most sorely missed as well. HARLEY STAGGERS has earned the respect and friendship of all who have served with him in Congress, on both sides of the aisle, and the Hall's of the Capitol will be noticeably emptier next January.●

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members of the House in congratulating our colleague HARLEY STAGGERS on his 32 years of fine service in the House of Representatives. He has ably served as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and has been a true friend to the working people of America over the years. He has served the people of West Virginia and this country well. He will be missed and we wish him the best during his retirement.●

● Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, HARLEY STAGGERS is a gentle, uncommon man.

For those who came to Congress after he did, HARLEY distinguished himself by offering a hand of friendship and meeting each of his colleagues, new or old, always, ever on level ground. He was an equal notwithstanding his seniority and prestige, a man in whom you had confidence immediately because you knew he cared for you.

We will miss HARLEY STAGGERS because of his legislative excellence, but we will miss him even more because of his excellence of character, his friendly smile, and his warm handclasp.●

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor to serve with the distinguished Representative from West Virginia, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. During the years he has served as chairman of the committee, he has been involved in some of the most important domestic legislation enacted by Congress. As chairman, he has demonstrated a sense of fairness, patience and understanding of the viewpoints of all the members of the committee, enabling the committee to function effectively in meeting its legislative responsibilities.

It has been an awesome responsibility, ranging from legislation and hearings on such diverse topics as communications, national energy policies, public health, environmental quality, transportation, consumer protection, and hazardous substances. Many of the hearings and decisions produced by the committee during HARLEY STAGGERS' term as chairman will affect the economic well-being of this country for decades to come.

During the years that I have had the pleasure of serving on the Commerce Committee, I have learned to respect and admire the skills of HARLEY O. STAGGERS in dealing with the many conflicting opinions and ambitions of the people who represent the public and private sectors of America. He has managed to bring them all together into the deliberations of his committee, and to reach honest compromises where differences in legislative matters seemed at first to be irreconcilable. Chairman STAGGERS has recognized that the strength of American democracy rests in the ability of men and women of different viewpoints to reach honest and effective compromise that bind our regions and people together in a search for the common good of America.

Chairman STAGGERS' consistent fairness and willingness to listen to the members of his committee have also distinguished his chairmanship. I have personally found him extremely fair and willing to go out of his way to assist new members of the committee in dealing with the complicated issues before us.

Chairman STAGGERS has always been devoted to the needs of the people of the great State of West Virginia and to the United States of America. Every effort that he has made in the Congress has been directed towards strengthening this Nation's economic system so that more Americans may share in the benefits and opportunities of this great Nation.

In tracing through his many years of outstanding public service in the Congress, it is clear that he has understood that economic growth and environmental protection must be brought into balance in order to preserve this great country for future generations.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to this distinguished American leader of Congress, HARLEY O. STAGGERS of West Virginia.●

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the end of the 96th Congress will bring with it the retirement from Congress—but I am sure not from public life—of a truly remarkable man whom I cherish not only as a leader but as an old and enduring friend, HARLEY O. STAGGERS.

When HARLEY STAGGERS leaves the House of Representatives, he will take with him 43 years of public service for the people of West Virginia and the Nation, 32 years as the Representative of the Second District and 14 as one of the really great chairmen of the oldest standing committee of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He will take with him vast experience and the affection and respect of his colleagues, but he will leave behind a record of achievement almost unparalleled in the annals of the House.

Under the leadership of Chairman STAGGERS, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has shaped laws extending and strengthening this Nation's public health services and facilities. It has pioneered in the protection of the environment, in the rehabilitation of our transportation systems, in the protection of the health, safety, and economic welfare of our citizens. Most recently, under his direction, the committee has become the cutting edge in shaping an effective national energy policy to meet the most serious challenge facing this Nation in the last quarter of the 20th century. It is enlightening to note that more than 30 years ago, HARLEY STAGGERS as a freshman Congressman warned of the Nation's growing dependence upon foreign oil and launched a fight to win energy independence for America through the development of synthetic fuels. This year when he retires, the chairman can see the vindication of his warning calling for new U.S. energy supplies in the enactment of the Nation's first synthetic fuels legislation.

In one way or another, most of the challenges that have faced this Nation over the past 14 years have touched the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Chairman STAGGERS has never failed to meet them and the record of his achievement is a proud one indeed.

In the future we can not again expect to see men tempered in the fires of HARLEY STAGGERS' experience. He is probably the last American statesman who can claim to have been born in a log cabin and he is uniquely a product of the closing era of pioneer America. He has served as a teacher, a sheriff, and a State official. He lived through and learned the lessons of the worst economic disaster to befall America, the Great Depression. He served his Nation as a navigator in the U.S. Air Force dur-

ing World War II. In all things, he put his Nation first.

This is an extraordinary man whom this 96th Congress will be saying goodbye to; an extraordinary man and, for me, a dear friend.

The late Franklin Delano Roosevelt once wisely observed that "to some generations much is given, of other generations much is expected." HARLEY O. STAGGERS came from a generation of which much was expected—even demanded. He will leave an indelible imprint upon that generation and upon those that follow. In no small part due to his personal efforts and commitment to his Nation, his generation met and fulfilled its rendezvous with destiny.●

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this year we will see the departure from the Congress of a well-respected and outstanding veteran colleague, HARLEY O. STAGGERS. It is a pleasure to join this afternoon in paying tribute to his illustrious and dedicated career in the House.

HARLEY will certainly be remembered as a man of great ability; a conscientious and highly capable legislator; and truly one of the giants of the House of Representatives. HARLEY is a deeply dedicated public servant, who has compiled an enviable record of achievement on the national level, while at the same time caring for the needs of his own constituency and the State of West Virginia. His good and balanced judgment deserves a sincere word of gratitude from those who have benefited from his outstanding record of service for the past 32 years.

Serving in the influential position as chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, HARLEY has shown his true awareness of the problems confronting the Congress and our country. He has certainly played a major role in the shaping of important energy legislation, and his efforts and achievements have most assuredly proven to be of special significance. He will be missed as chairman, but his deeds and accomplishments shall be testimony to his exemplary service.

Mrs. Derwinski joins with me in extending our best wishes to HARLEY and his wife, Mary, and their family for a long and enjoyable retirement. We are all grateful for the leadership and guidance provided by HARLEY STAGGERS.●

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, I rise along with my fellow colleagues to salute the gentleman from West Virginia, my friend HARLEY O. STAGGERS, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Mr. STAGGERS has been an active and distinguished Member of the House since 1949, and for his accomplishments, he will be warmly remembered.

As the representative of the people of Puerto Rico in Congress, I deeply regret Mr. STAGGERS' decision to retire. The gentleman from West Virginia has been a good friend to Puerto Rico through his many years in service, and has showed great sensibility in understanding the peculiar problems of Puerto Rico.

We will all feel the loss of this outstanding man, but we all know that he will continue maintaining, in the future,

a role of public leadership that has so distinguished him in the past, and because of his contributions to a better America, he certainly will always be an asset to our Nation.●

● Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor for me to express my admiration and respect for Congressman HARLEY STAGGERS of West Virginia. His long and distinguished career in Congress is well known and needs no repetition by me at this time. However, I would like to express my appreciation for the valuable service he has rendered to the Nation and to West Virginia. I would also like to convey my gratitude for the friendship and advice which he extended for many years to me and my late husband.

I know the chairman will be deeply missed by the Members of Congress in the future as well as by his admiring constituents. Maryland's Sixth Congressional District, which I represent, shares a long border with his district across the Potomac River and our region will lose an extremely valuable ally in Washington when he retires. My husband and I frequently cooperated with him on projects which affect both western Maryland and West Virginia and I know that there could be no more dedicated and effective advocate for the people of West Virginia.

During my extensive travels throughout western Maryland in the past year, it has been my pleasure to meet many of his constituents from across the river in West Virginia. I know that he is held in the highest regard by the people he represents. His untiring efforts to improve the quality of life in his district and our country are widely known and deeply appreciated.●

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to thank all my colleagues who have joined me in this special order honoring this special man.

I want to thank all those who were here personally and who have submitted their comments for the RECORD.

In conclusion, I just want to thank the Representative from West Virginia, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. HARLEY STAGGERS. We have heard him characterized as a decent man, as a family man, as a Christian man, as a man who works on behalf of not only the working men and women of this country, but works on behalf of the State of West Virginia and the United States of America.

#### TRIBUTE TO HON. TOM STEED, OF OKLAHOMA, ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 60 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?



There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, my first speech before this body, 7 years ago, was occasioned by the loss of one of America's greatest leaders and public servants—Lyndon Johnson. I come before my colleagues today because we are losing, to retirement, another great man—my friend, my colleague, and my teacher, TOM STEED.

TOM STEED is retiring after one of the most distinguished careers of public service the House of Representatives has ever witnessed. When TOM retires at the end of this session he will have completed 32 uninterrupted years in Congress. This is the longest period anyone from our State has ever served.

His longevity in the House is surely matched by the quality of his service to Oklahoma and the Nation. His work has helped not only countless people in Oklahoma, but throughout the United States. He has risen to chair the Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government. He is the ranking majority member of the Committee on Small Business.

His work in those important roles are well known to his colleagues. But TOM's importance and influence extends far beyond those highly visible positions. To so many of us, he is and has been a good friend and teacher.

I first came to know and work with TOM STEED when I came to Washington to work on the staff of another Oklahoma Congressman, Ed Edmondson. When I joined President Johnson's staff, we in the White House often called on TOM—benefiting from his years of experience and his commonsense as we worked together to try to solve the problems that faced America.

I can honestly say that there was no one in Congress that President Johnson respected more than TOM STEED. As a former legislator he knew of and respected TOM's legislative knowledge and abilities. But what the President respected most about TOM STEED was an uncanny ability that he possessed.

The President knew that in TOM STEED he had, in most circumstances, a loyal supporter. This helped smooth the way on many of our legislative initiatives. But, of course, there were occasions when TOM could not agree with our positions. When that was the case, the President always knew that TOM would tell him when and why he thought the President was wrong. I think it was the honesty as much as anything else that so endeared TOM to Lyndon Johnson.

When I returned to Oklahoma and entered private law practice, I continued to follow TOM's outstanding career. And when I came to Congress as a freshman in 1973, TOM STEED was still here as a senior member of the Oklahoma delegation. He was always available to give sound advice to younger Members. But we did not have to ask him anything to learn from him. Anyone could benefit by merely watching him. His decency, dignity, and compassion for those he serves so well are models that anyone could be proud to emulate.

His sense of humor is wonderful. TOM

always has a good story to tell to help brighten your day. He has helped many of us keep a sense of humor in the face of increasing workloads and a multitude of world problems.

But certainly the most impressive thing about him is his legislative ability. I say that is the most impressive thing, but not the most noticeable. You will almost never see TOM's name in the paper connected with a conflict. I feel this is a good indication of his tremendous legislative skills.

TOM is a master of compromise. He works out any difficulties before they arise to complicate his legislation. So the appropriations bills that he is responsible for always seem to be the ones that have the least trouble on their paths through the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, no one deserves to enjoy retirement more than TOM STEED. He has devoted 32 years to public service and will now return to the area he served so long and so well, to people of Oklahoma who love and respect him. But Washington and the Congress will miss his courage and his humor, as we will miss his expertise and knowledge.

In that light, Mr. Speaker, I have a recommendation to make to my State. I hope Oklahoma uses the knowledge and ability TOM STEED is carrying back to Oklahoma with him. He may be retiring from Congress, but he will never retire from public service. I am sure they recognize his experience and his commonsense. I think it would be especially appropriate to put them to use in the classroom. In the classroom TOM can help to build another generation of concerned and educated Americans. Perhaps one of them will rise to serve their country for as long and as well as TOM STEED has served it.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include three newspaper articles that I think aptly summarize the feelings of all Oklahomans:

[From the Tulsa World, Tuesday, Feb. 19, 1980]

#### STEED: A JOB WELL DONE

Rep. Tom Steed of Shawnee is more than an Oklahoma Congressman. He is an Oklahoma institution. His decision to retire at the end of his present term signals a loss of prestige and power in Washington not only for his own Fourth District, but for the entire State.

We call Steed Oklahoma's unofficial Congressman-at-Large. There is no part of the State that has not benefited from his counsel and his stature as the respected chairman of the Treasury appropriations subcommittee.

In fact, Steed has officially represented a large part of Oklahoma—from Sapulpa to Altus—at one time or another. His original Fourth District stretched from Creek County to the Oklahoma County line and South into a wide swath of Little Dixie. After being reapportioned twice, the District was shifted to include most of the State to the Southwest of his home base in Pottawatomie County.

With nearly 32 years and 16 terms to his credit, Steed holds the Oklahoma record for service in Congress. But the honors and praise now being poured on the Shawnee Democrat by his constituents, colleagues and friends are not for his political longevity.

He is being recognized not for length of service, but quality of service.

Steed might have served longer. At 75, he is as sharp and energetic as ever. But his doctor's precautions about potential health problems prompted him to call it quits at the end of his 16th term.

As always when a popular and accomplished person retires from an important job, Steed's announcement last Saturday sounded a note of poignancy.

Poignancy and even a little sadness. But no regrets. After all, Tom Steed has had one helluva run.

#### TEARS MARK END OF ERA—STEED ANNOUNCES COMING RETIREMENT

(By Chuck Ervin)

OKLAHOMA CITY.—With tears in his eyes and his voice breaking, U.S. Rep. Tom Steed announced the end of an era Saturday—his retirement after 32 years in Congress.

"After consulting with my doctors, I can't honestly say I will be able to remain healthy and active," the 75-year-old Shawnee Democrat said.

"Therefore, I will not, repeat not, be a candidate for re-election. It is a decision that is made more in sadness than in joy, but one I will not change."

Steed became choked up and had to pause several times during his statement to newsmen and women attending the midwinter convention of the Oklahoma Press Association.

He has served in Congress longer than any other Oklahoman.

When Steed first was elected in 1948, the late Roy J. Turner was governor. Former House Speaker Carl Albert of McAlester was an obscure freshman congressman from Little Dixie, and the late Robert S. Kerr—later "the uncrowned king of the Senate"—was a second-year freshman only beginning his rise to power.

The late Harry S. Truman was president. The victories of World War II were still fresh in the minds of Oklahomans, and Korea was only an unfamiliar name on the map.

"I will return to Oklahoma and try to find the life as a private citizen I left behind 32 years ago," Steed said Saturday. "I intend to spend my declining years in the state I love, among the people who mean the most to me."

The feisty Steed was seldom at a loss for words, on the floor of the House, in committee or in private conversation. He recalled Saturday how former Sen. Fred R. Harris once described him as: "the only man I know, who can corner you in the middle of a room."

U.S. Rep. Glenn English, D-Cordell, one of those who extolled Steed's virtues Saturday, said he had just had a normal brief conversation with him "for about three hours."

Steed also is known for his sometimes caustic wit.

When asked by a reporter once why he had been flying first class instead of traveling coach as required by state law, Steed replied: "Because I'm a first class congressman."

When Jay Wilkinson, an attractive, All-American football player and the son of former OU football Coach Bud Wilkinson, ran against him and appeared to have Steed on the ropes with a television and billboard campaign featuring the young Wilkinson striding across a field and looking up at the sky, Steed turned the tables and had him virtually laughed out of the race.

"Any fool knows you don't look up when you walk across a cow pasture," he said.

But his tongue occasionally got him in trouble.

Steed remembered Saturday how Kerr, less than pleased with a biting introduction from his colleague, once said:

"Take a good look at him, folks. He's the only man in the world who can put both feet in his mouth at once."

The man Steed defeated for Congress in 1948, Lyle Boren, was in the audience Saturday, as was his son, U.S. Sen. David Boren.

"Not only has he been the Congressman for the 4th District, he's been the Congressman for the whole state of Oklahoma," Boren said. "He's my friend, my teacher and my colleague."

Most of Oklahoma's congressional delegation was present, and Steed's announcement triggered an outpouring of praise.

"Tom worked valiantly for Oklahoma and the nation," said Republican Sen. Henry Bellmon, who also is retiring. "There never has been a Congressman who was more popular, more respected or more trusted than Tom Steed," he added.

Gov. George Nigh praised him for his "unselfish and completely dedicated years of service."

"You will continue in public life through the impact you've had on those of us in Congress that are younger," said Rep. James R. Jones, D-Tulsa.

"Thank you for the wisdom and expertise you gave us," said Rep. Glenn English, D-Correll.

"I'm the freshman, and I'm the one closest to him," said Rep. Mike Synar, D-Muskogee. "I'll never be the Congressman I could have been, without him."

"I love you, Tom."

Steed later cited progress in Oklahoma he and others worked for during his years in Congress.

"We've made Oklahoma one of the 10 fastest growing states in the nation," he said. "The greatest thing we did was stop the exportation of our children."

"We've just got the foundation built. Now we're ready to go on to the next phase."

"Father Time is a relentless old fellow. He just won't quit taking a toll on you. I hate to quit a job I've had as much fun as I've had in this one. But I'm going to come back and enjoy some of the things I helped build."

"This is the greatest place in the world to live."

"If that sounds corny, I don't care."

#### AN INTERESTING GUY—RETIRING TOM STEED FITS MANY DESCRIPTIONS (By Jenk Jones, Jr.)

You could string a number of adjectives in front of Tom Steed's name: powerful, crafty, tough, patriotic, gabby, frascible, opinionated.

Above all, colorful.

Steed, two weeks short of his 76th birthday, today announced he will retire from Congress after this term because of declining health. He is in his 32nd year in office, a record for an Oklahoman.

A Democrat from Shawnee, his 4th District today is radically different from the boundaries when he first was elected.

Congress was a second career for the native of Rising Star, Texas. He spent 20 years as a newspaperman, the last four as a managing editor in Shawnee, before running for the House.

He wasn't afraid of big name foes. His first victory, in 1948, came in a Democratic runoff over five-term congressional veteran Lyle Boren, father of Sen. David Boren.

The next year he walloped another former Democratic Congressman, Glen D. Johnson.

So potent a politician did Steed become in six times he was unchallenged in party primaries and four times drew no GOP opposition.

By far his closest call was a 364-vote squeaker against Republican Truman Branscum in 1966. Two years later, Steed was

thrown against another incumbent congressman, the GOP's James V. Smith, following court-ordered congressional redistricting. Steed won by 9,099 votes out of more than 125,000 cast.

Steed is the fourth-highest ranking Democrat on the powerful House Appropriations Committee and chairman of its subcommittee on Treasury, post office and general government.

As such, he has been in a position to fight for Oklahoma projects, especially the major military installations (Tinker Air Force Base, Fort Sill, Altus Air Force Base) within his district.

He also was a vital cog in securing money for the Kerr-McClellan Navigational System which made Tulsa a seaport.

Steed always has been a talker, sometimes to the dismay of the newsmen or audience he held captive for marathon sessions. (He once took 16 minutes to introduce Sen. Mike Monroney to a political gathering; Monroney was then a 24-year veteran of Congress and could have been presented in a sentence.)

And sometimes his language has a barracks flavor (especially when he talks about the Senate, his prime objection of scorn. Try calling the Senate the "upper house" within Steed's hearing.)

But he has been a shrewd observer of government and the men and women who run it, and unwise is the listener who doesn't heed the congressman's words.

He also was a vital ally of Carl Albert when the latter from the neighboring 3rd District, was House majority leader and then Speaker.

With Albert retired after 30 years of service and Sen. Henry Bellmon stepping aside this year, Steed is guaranteed to be Oklahoma's longevity champ in the 20th century.

Even if 1st District Rep. James R. Jones, after Bellmon the longest serving member of the state's delegation, were to stay in Congress until the year 2000, he would be four years short of Steed's mark.

Steed served through four years of Harry Truman's term, the entire presidencies of Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford and the first term of Jimmy Carter. There may be another president-elect before the Oklahoman officially leaves office when his term expires in January.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in paying tribute to my chairman, the Honorable TOM STEED, who has decided to retire at the end of this session.

I have worked alongside Tom for 20 years now. He has been my friend, my mentor, my confident, my storyteller. Every winter for 10 years he has whispered to me that he was going to pack it in, and every winter I would beg him not to do it. This year he whispered he was going to pack it in, I begged him not to do it—and I went on to other things. We had, after all, established a nice working relationship regarding this. It is almost a breach of faith for him to change the rules at this late date and actually go ahead and retire.

I frankly could not believe the news when I heard he was going to retire. In shock, I went to him and said, "Why are you doing this?" He gave me a very typical TOM STEED answer. After 32 years in Congress and 43 years of storytelling preceding that, he had recently noticed himself repeating a story for the second

time. When the job gets so demanding that a dedicated storyteller does not have time to add to his collection, it is beginning to interfere with the important things in life.

I will say flatly that even with all of the wonderful talents that Oklahoma has sent to the House of Representatives during my tenure that none have achieved such universal trust and affection as has TOM STEED. I cannot recall having ever seen a TOM STEED press release. I cannot remember TOM ever engaging in an act of vanity, despite the enormous power he has wielded for so many years. I cannot recall a mean or spiteful act, despite a temper that has been known to explode when people fail to live up to their promises. I do not know that he has a single enemy in this House or in this capital city. I do not know how he does it.

I know that the great State of Oklahoma has a great many talents among its citizens, and I am sure that the successor to my chairman will be a fine person, dedicated to doing good works. But in losing the service of a man like TOM STEED, the Nation suffers more than it will realize, for it is the experience accumulated over decades that is valuable and not replaceable. For myself, and all of us who have served over the years with this good man, the loss is even greater. It is a personal loss, as well, and with Tom as he leaves goes part of our youth and our happy memories.

But it does not pay to get too sentimental about or around TOM STEED. He retains from his old newspapering days the sharp retort that cuts sentimentality off at the roots. And so, before I become a target myself for my chairman, I will quietly back off and say only that I learned of his planned retirement with sorrow and personal loss. But I wish him well in the many years of retirement facing him, and I know that this restless soul would not sit idle for too long before he takes up a cause or two close to his heart.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McEWEN).

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would be indeed remiss if I did not say just a few words about my subcommittee chairman who has decided to leave this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege, along with my colleague, the gentleman from New York who just spoke (Mr. ADDABBO) to serve on the committee of Chairman STEED, the Committee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government. It is a committee, Mr. Speaker, that covers a great deal. I must say that my chairman, not until I went on his subcommittee did I find out how many things that phrase "general government" covers. That picks up a lot of little things like the White House and a few other agencies and departments of this Government; but Chairman STEED has always been inordinately kind and if I may say so, tolerant when the witness was passed if this Member or another Member wanted to pursue a rather ex-



tensive line of questioning. He was never impatient with us, always generous in affording all Members of the subcommittee the opportunity to question the witnesses.

□ 1910

I want to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I am going to miss him here in this Chamber. I am going to miss him in that subcommittee, I am going to miss him in the Longworth Cafeteria for those breakfasts that some of us gather for over there, and as a neighbor over in the annex.

I would just say I know he leaves a group here that holds him in great affection to go back to a district that has manifested their regard and their affection for him for a lot of years in sending him to this body. To TOM STEED and to his wife I just offer my thanks for having known them and my best wishes for the years that are ahead for them.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ENGLISH).

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinctive gentleman who has served Oklahoma in the House of Representatives with wisdom and unquestioned effectiveness for more than 3 decades.

TOM STEED has done as much as any one Oklahoman to give our State a strong voice in Washington over the past 32 years. And he has guided me, and most of my Oklahoma colleagues, through the tortuous process of learning how to best serve our constituents here in the House.

But I have most appreciated Tom for his candor. In a group of 435 individuals who are noted for their ability to avoid making direct statements, Congressman STEED truly stands apart. His willingness to speak bluntly on the most controversial measures is legendary in Oklahoma. But it is this very quality which has enabled the dean of the Oklahoma congressional delegation to startle all of us into a clearer and more balanced view of our work in Washington.

If any Oklahoman has earned the gratitude of his State, that individual is TOM STEED. And if any Member of Congress has earned the right to put aside the burdens of elected office, that Member is TOM STEED. We all stand ready to offer Tom our best wishes for a long and enjoyable retirement.

But Tom is an Oklahoma original, and it will be many long years before the vacuum which his departure is creating can be filled. And in the Congresses to come, he will be sorely missed.

And so I join with my colleagues in thanking Tom, on behalf of all Americans, for his dedicated service in our behalf, and in extending to him our best wishes for a most happy return to private life.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman. I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (Mr. STAGGERS).

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress with TOM STEED 32 years ago. TOM STEED has been one of the outstanding Members of this Congress, and I am not going to take the time to extol all of his great qualities and the great things he has done. But Oklahoma can be doubly proud of him and his service here for the kind of man that he has been.

We have a little quotation back home that I believe exemplifies TOM STEED. He believes in gentlemanliness, honest chivalry, clean-minded and God-fearing manliness. He believes in man, the masterpiece of all creation. He believes in God, the eminent architect of the universe, the compassionate ruler of destiny. Tom has lived that kind of life here, and we have all enjoyed his stories and enjoyed his companionship, his fairness to his country, to his colleagues here, and to his fellow man.

I believe that he fits another little saying:

I have to live with myself and so, I want to be fit for myself to know.

I want to be able, as the days go by, always to look myself in the eye.

I do not want to stand with the setting sun and hate myself for things I have done.

I want to go out with my head erect; I want to deserve every man's respect.

TOM STEED is going out of this Congress in just exactly that manner. He has the respect of all the Members of this Congress. He should have the respect of all of the people of Oklahoma and all America for the job that he has done.

To him I say may his retirement be happy for him and his family and long and enjoyable.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those comments. I can tell the gentleman that no two gentlemen will be missed more or are respected more than you and TOM STEED.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I thank my colleague from Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my respects along with my colleagues that have preceded me to the Honorable TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, a Member who has the total and entire respect of this entire body.

Of course, my colleague from New York, JOE ADDABO, who served intimately with him on the Committee on Appropriations, discussed the great sense of humor and the storytelling ability that TOM STEED has. I think all of us know that. My son was stationed at one of the military bases in Oklahoma, and Tom had gone down there as a speaker several summers ago. I instructed the young man to be sure that he said hello to the Congressman. He returned in a month and he said "I reported to him," and I said, "Well, what did he tell you?" And he said "He told me a story."

So, Tom is consistent, not only with us, but he is also consistent with the youth of America and, of course, his constituents and his friends and everyone alike.

But the real accomplishment of TOM STEED is as a protector of the Nation's

pursestrings. There is no member on the Appropriations Committee with greater fidelity to protecting the taxpayer than TOM STEED and, at the same time, making sure that the programs of America that are vital and necessary are properly funded. That meant putting up with a little demagogery on one side and a little demagogery on the other, and writing a bill, an appropriation bill that fit the need exactly for this country and meets the needs of the taxpayers and does not hurt them. TOM STEED always met that trust and, Tom, we are going to miss you and we are going to miss you just as much as we are going to miss our colleague that we have just honored who came here to the Congress with you. As I said, you may well be succeeded, but you will never be replaced.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman and yield to my colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. SYNAR).

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Congressman from the donut hole of my district for having this tonight because he becomes the new dean, and we all know that the steps and shoes he must fill are going to be great due to the great contributions of TOM STEED.

I rise tonight on behalf of all the people of the Second District of Oklahoma and the thousands of Oklahomans who could not be here tonight to pay special tribute to a man that has been the Congressman for Oklahoma for many years. In fact, because of that service, today the Governor of the State of Oklahoma made the following proclamation:

#### TOM STEED APPRECIATION DAY

Whereas, the Dean of Oklahoma's Congressional Delegation, the Honorable Tom Steed from Oklahoma's Fourth Congressional District has announced his retirement from the United States House of Representatives; and

Whereas, the United States House of Representatives is appropriately paying tribute this day to Congressman Steed; and

Whereas, the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Oklahoma, and the entire State of Oklahoma, have long recognized and appreciated the dedicated and able public service and leadership Congressman Steed has performed for Oklahoma and the United States for the past 32 years; and

Whereas, the people of Oklahoma recognize that the tireless efforts, the integrity and the ability of Tom Steed are rare qualities; and

Whereas, the people of Oklahoma wish to join with Members of the Honorable United States House of Representatives on this day in proclaiming and paying tribute to a strong, honest and truly exceptional leader,

Now, therefore, I, George Nigh, Governor of the State of Oklahoma, do hereby declare this 26th day of February, 1980, as Tom Steed Appreciation Day in Oklahoma.

GEORGE NIGH,  
Governor.

I rise tonight to say thank you to a great Oklahoman, a great American and, most of all, one of the finest men I will ever meet.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman and I yield at this time to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS).

□ 1920

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. JONES) for holding this special order tonight here on the floor of the House for the Dean of the Oklahoma delegation, TOM STEED.

THOMAS JEFFERSON STEED was born near Rising Star, Tex. A rising star TOM STEED truly was; a rising star TOM STEED truly became. It was Oklahoma's good fortune that he moved with his parents as a small child to Konawa in Seminole County just north of my hometown of Ada. Later it was TOM STEED's good fortune to marry his sweetheart, Hazel, who has been by his side for 57 years, and Hazel is beside him tonight as she looks on from the House Gallery.

Congressman TOM STEED set a new record which I predict will never be broken for length of service in Congress from Oklahoma when he was reelected to his 16th 2-year term in 1978. TOM STEED's retirement ends a dynasty for the Oklahoma congressional delegation. The young Democrat was first elected in 1948 with another crusty, straightforward-talking Democrat who headed the Democrat Party ticket, TOM STEED's close personal friend, Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States. TOM STEED holds the most powerful position regarding appropriations of anyone ever to represent Oklahoma in the House through his service as chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury—Postal Service—General Government of the Committee on Appropriations.

I will long remember his service in this House in a more personal way for his personal advice, guidance, and counsel to me and the other young Members of the Oklahoma delegation. I will also remember the first time I went to TOM STEED for that first bit of advice. He said, "Wes, there are three things you need to have in your makeup around this House to last." I asked, "Tom, what are they?" His remark, "Wes, first you need to be patient. Second, you need to be patient. And, third, you need to be patient."

TOM STEED already knew the best advice that he could give to me.

TOM, as I have said to you, may God grant me your wisdom to quit this Congress someday in the same position that you hold, and that is on top. Thank you, TOM STEED, for the contributions you have made to me personally, to our great State of Oklahoma, to our great Nation, and for your dedication to build a better world for the future generations to come.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to stand here and speak about my good friend of 22 years, but it is a distinct personal pleasure to join in this fitting tribute to my friend, TOM STEED. I have had the privilege to serve with TOM on both the Appropriations and Small Business Committees.

For several years, TOM served as the ranking majority member—and briefly

as chairman—of the Committee on Small Business, while I served as that committee's ranking minority member. I also had the good fortune to serve for 5 years as the ranking minority member of the Treasury-Postal Service Subcommittee while TOM served as that panel's chairman. During this Congress, of course, as the ranking minority member of the full Appropriations Committee, I have continued to have the opportunity and the privilege to work with TOM.

Thus, I speak from experience when I say that TOM STEED has been superb as a legislator and as chairman. He has always been fair, decent, and honest with witnesses and Members alike.

His background as a newspaperman and his Oklahoma commonsense have served him and all Americans well in his annual handling of the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill.

TOM's Appropriations Subcommittee provides the funding for what might be described as this Nation's housekeepers, bill collectors, and general managers—both current and past. For the past 16 of TOM's distinguished years in the House of Representatives, he has been the overseer for the nuts and bolts of the Federal Government. Funding and policy directives have been provided, on a strictly nonpartisan basis, for White House operations, the Treasury Department, including the Internal Revenue Service, the General Services Administration, the Postal Service, the Federal Election Commission, and a host of other Federal agencies. He has supported civil service reform in the transition from the Civil Service Commission to the Office of Personnel Management and the Merit Systems Protection Board.

It is obvious that in this list of agencies, there have been many pressures to react in a political or mischievous manner, according to the popular will at the time. TOM has always resisted these pressures—and our Federal Government system is better because of his service.

But, of course, we all know that TOM STEED has always been more than just a chairman to those who have served with him. He is a fine, loyal friend, and he also happens to be the best storyteller in the House. I wish I had just half of his ability to spin a yarn. Perhaps it comes from his background of being born on a farm near someplace called Rising Star, Tex.,—or from spending 20 years as a newspaperman and 32 years as a Congressman. That kind of exposure has provided a lot of material for jokes, and our buddy, TOM, has made the most of it.

Another great story-teller and Oklahoman, Will Rogers, once professed that he could state honestly that he had never met a man he did not like. Well, I am not a great story-teller, or an Oklahoman, but I can honestly state I have never met a man (or a woman) who did not like TOM STEED.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues will forgive a purely personal comment, I would like to say that, during my 22 years in this body, I have had no more valued or enjoyable experience than the warm friendship I have shared with TOM. Although his retirement may alter

our working relationship, I take great comfort in knowing that our friendship will continue.

This tribute today is well-timed, because this is TOM and Hazel Steed's 57th wedding anniversary. They were married on February 26, 1923. Hazel, as many of you know, not only shares the many burdens of a congressional wife, she also happens to have created one of the finest decorative egg collections in the world. I remember years ago when TOM and I were looking at Coast Guard operations in the Johnson Islands. There were millions of gooney birds there, and TOM was careful to bring home a gooney bird egg for his wife.

We wish TOM and Hazel a very happy anniversary, and offer our heartfelt wishes for many more to come. They have been an inspiration to all of us.

In closing, I think that one of the greatest things that can be said about a man is that he is a good man. In my book TOM STEED is a good man.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) very much.

□ 1930

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, we all wish TOM STEED the greatest joy in his retirement years. Those of us who have had the privilege of knowing TOM and Hazel STEED will always cherish the advice, counsel, and friendship that they have given to us. We could recount so many stories of the advice TOM STEED has given to each of us that, hopefully, has made us better Members of Congress and better public servants but it can truly be said that no one that I have ever known has a higher respect for public service and done a better job of performing public service than TOM STEED.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

● Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the colleague we honor today, TOM STEED, set a record for longevity in his home State of Oklahoma when he was elected to a 16th term in Congress in 1978.

That reelection record is the clearest indication of the great affection the people of his district and State have for TOM STEED. We all know TOM's outstanding work as chairman of the House Treasury, Post Office, and General Government Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and his select committee work that helped create the Small Business Administration.

In 32 years in Congress, TOM STEED has fought untiringly for the interests of his district, which houses Tinker Air Force Base, Fort Sill, and Altus Air Force Base.

Similarly, his work as a senior member of the Appropriations Committee has had a profound impact on such national concerns as defense, education, agriculture, water conservation, and transportation. TOM's interests have ranged from upgrading the Library of Congress to helping create our national highway system.

For 20 years before his election to Congress, TOM STEED was a newspaperman and it is fitting, Mr. Speaker, that the journals in his district and in the State at large have heaped on TOM both praise and expressions of gratitude.

Back home he has earned the universal



praise for his skill as a legislator, his toughness and his honesty. That view of TOM STEED is shared here in Washington and I join in expressing the best wishes for TOM and his wife, Hazel, on their well-earned retirement from Congress. ●

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, Congressman TOM STEED will be long remembered for the omnipresent humor which he shared with his colleagues on a daily basis.

TOM has served the Congress and the country since his first election to the 81st Congress on November 2, 1948. He has accomplished a great deal, and has done so with abiding graciousness and good humor. These qualities endeared him to all of the Members of the House, by whom he will be remembered with great fondness. ●

● Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in special tribute for our friend, TOM STEED's 32 years of service in this body. Without a doubt, he has served his constituents and his State of Oklahoma well.

Like all Members of Congress who have sought to do their best in representing what they determined to be as the public interest, TOM STEED has seen his share of political battles during his tenure in this House. He has weathered them well, and now is able to withdraw from the legislative battles for a well-deserved retirement. I want to express to TOM my sincerest wish for a happy and constructive retirement. ●

● Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, this legislative body will lose a longtime and outstanding Member at the end of the 96th Congress when our colleague from the Fourth District of Oklahoma, Mr. TOM STEED, retires.

He has served in the House since 1949—over three decades of dedicated service to his constituents and the Nation, through two wars and many domestic, economic, and social challenges. I have had the privilege of serving with TOM STEED during most of his tenure in the Congress, and consider him a friend of long standing.

He has served the country during tumultuous times, and as a member of the House Appropriations Committee has played an important role in the tough job of deciding priorities for Federal outlays.

I join my fellow House Members in deserved recognition of his long and illustrious career in the House, and wish him a long, happy, and fulfilling retirement. ●

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, TOM STEED has served in the House longer than almost everyone here. It surprised me when I heard of his plans to retire at the end of this session. His many long years of dedicated public service include 20 years spent as a newsman. TOM's ability to serve his district well is due in no small part to that previous experience, as well as his experience here on the Hill as an administrative assistant prior to being elected to Congress in 1948.

TOM is an excellent example of the bipartisan attitude that needs to exist if we, as a collective body, are to serve the people. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and Gen-

eral Government of the Appropriations Committee; TOM put in many long hours that to others would be a thankless task. And as a member of the Small Business Committee, he worked long and hard toward the betterment of the small, independent businessman, who is really the backbone of our American economic system.

Yet, all those many years of public service do take a toll on an individual. At 76, TOM STEED needs some time for himself and his family. It will take a while for us to become accustomed to his absence, but all of us need to accept TOM's decision to retire as the right one.

I wish TOM all the best in his retirement, though I wonder how his constituents will fare without him. But, the fact that he will no longer be in Washington will most likely spur TOM on to help his district in other ways, in any way he can. We will miss him a great deal, and hope that he will visit us from time to time. My wife, Lee, and I wish TOM, his wife Hazel, and their son Richard, the best in years to come. ●

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, TOM STEED has announced that he will not seek reelection to the House of Representatives. This is sad news for the people of Oklahoma's Fourth Congressional District. It is sad news for me, too; TOM and I are very close neighbors on the fourth floor of the Rayburn Building. I served under his chairmanship for 2 years on the Postal Service and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee, and we now share an assignment on the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee. I respect him greatly and will miss his presence in the Congress very much.

Most of the people in TOM's district have never had another Representative. And it has been to their benefit. Few here today know the House of Representatives like TOM does. He is a hard worker and a master of the political process. TOM's successor has a tough act to follow. ●

● Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, ex-newspapermen bring a special quality to politics. Having seen human nature in its infinite variety of disguises, they develop a certain skepticism. Seeing the world go on despite daily catastrophes, they develop a sense of humor.

A newsman before he came to Washington, TOM STEED has both these qualities and they stood him in good stead during his career in Congress.

To have spent 32 fruitful years in this often frustrating institution, he needed a fine sense of humor. To have done such a commendable job on the Appropriations Committee, a deep strain of skepticism was required.

As guardian of the Treasury, Post Office, and White House budgets, TOM STEED performed a great service for his country. As a man whose quick wit was a breath of fresh air in these sometimes stuffy corridors, he performed an additional service for his colleagues.

I wish him the best of luck in retirement. The people of Shawnee will be regaining a man of wit and wisdom. The House of Representatives will be losing a valuable Member. ●

● Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, TOM STEED's fourth floor office in the Rayburn Building is just down the hall from me. It overlooks the west front Capitol grounds and affords perhaps the most scenic view of the Capitol building itself.

As inspiring as this is, it is not the major source of TOM STEED's inspiration. That major source stems from the Fourth District of Oklahoma and the people who inhabit it. Home holds no terror for TOM. He loves and respects the people back home and they love and respect him.

When I ran for Congress I chose as my slogan the most important commitment I could make—"to remember who I am, where I'm from, and who sent me."

I submit that Congressman STEED has subscribed to that same, important standard. He has remembered that he is the servant and not the master; he has remembered his roots and he has remembered to whom he is responsible.

His service is distinguished because he has the common touch—he will be remembered as the uncommon man which he is. ●

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I feel especially honored to participate in this tribute to our friend and colleague, TOM STEED.

TOM STEED's exemplary career of public service has been a special inspiration for me. As a former reporter, I know that TOM's background as a newspaperman on Oklahoma dailies has given him a clear insight into the needs and problems of his constituents and a firm grip on those of the Nation.

As a Vietnam veteran, I also know that his outstanding service in Burma during World War II has given TOM sensitivity and wisdom in dealing with the difficult issues we now face in our foreign military commitments.

More than 31 years of service have culminated in TOM's vigorous and capable leadership in the House Small Business and Appropriations Committees.

Under Chairman STEED, the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee of Appropriations has charted the operation of some of our country's most important public services. The Postal Service's remarkable fiscal turnaround from a deficit to a profit is only one fitting tribute to his vigilant effort to improve a vital service.

Small businesses will lose a faithful and influential voice when TOM retires next January, and the Congress will face the difficult task of trying to fill his shoes.

He has been a friend and a model for me and I know many of our colleagues will join me in wishing him a happy retirement. ●

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the most distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, TOM STEED.

For 32 years, TOM STEED has been an effective and dedicated spokesman for the people of Oklahoma. I have had the privilege of serving with him on the Appropriations Committee for many of the years that I have been in Congress. I can attest to the high regard with

which he is held by the other members of that committee, and the value which they place on his judgment and his advice. He has served with distinction as chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee from 1961 through 1964 and as the chairman of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee from 1965 to the present. Serving under his leadership on that subcommittee gave me an opportunity to observe the way in which he met the special challenges and demands which confront anyone who serves as an Appropriations Subcommittee chairman. I found him to be uniformly even-handed and fair, and always solicitous of the opinions of all members, regardless of seniority and regardless of party. The work of his subcommittees and the full Appropriations Committee have been immeasurably aided on numerous occasions by the qualities of persistence and incisiveness which he developed as a newspaperman.

TOM STEED has served the citizens of Oklahoma in Congress longer than anyone in the State's history. In an occupation where tenure is often extremely short, and job performance is under constant review, that record is a fitting testament to the special faith which his constituents have in him. They have placed their trust in his integrity, his character, and his ability to represent their interests for portions of five of the most tumultuous decades in American history. Those of us who have worked with TOM STEED over those years know that that trust was never broken.

The retirement of TOM STEED will deprive the House of one of its most respected Members. We will miss his wisdom and his counsel. I know I join with all of his many friends in Congress in wishing TOM and his wife Hazel many, many happy and productive years when they return to Oklahoma.●

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when TOM STEED retires, Congress loses our own Will Rogers. It is interesting that TOM comes from Oklahoma because he has the same homespun delightful humor that was the trademark of Will Rogers.

In all the rush and confusion of Congress, the most refreshing experiences I have during the days are walking over to the Capitol with TOM STEED. It seems we average about seven trips a day from our office here in Rayburn over to the House floor for votes. Whenever you turn to TOM and ask for a good story, he always has one. I hope when he settles down in that friendly Oklahoma country that he takes time to prepare the five volumes that would be needed to sum up all of the wonderful stories and experiences he has had.

TOM has been an excellent Congressman. He knows appropriations from A to Z. When he gets ready to review his bills, he knows where there is merit in adjustments and when there is fat that needs to be eliminated. TOM is a fair, honest, and sincere legislator. TOM STEED is not only well liked, but he has gained a high respect from all of us.

Oklahoma is losing one of its greatest sons when he leaves us this year. Those

of us from the Southwest are proud of TOM STEED. Many Members have said I have never known a nicer guy than TOM STEED who ever served in Congress.●

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, TOM STEED is our Rock of Gibraltar of the House of Representatives. A Member of the House since 1949, TOM STEED was born near Rising Star, Tex. So the Texas delegation can almost claim him as one of our own. But all of us can claim him as one of the stars, one of the standouts of this institution. Even before he assumed office, TOM STEED served as an assistant to a total of three Congressmen. So I presume he has been active in congressional matters perhaps longer than anyone else.

Indeed, TOM STEED was one of those young turks in the early 1930's who looked at another young man named Lyndon B. Johnson and saw that he had great potential. He supported L.B.J. for speaker of the "Little Congress," an organization of administrative assistants of Congressmen.

TOM STEED's profession as a journalist taught him to be inquisitive, factual, fair, and aggressive. He has never accepted the status quo simply because someone says it is so. TOM looks into a question and decides on the facts. When he speaks out in his district or in the Congress, TOM STEED is one of the roughest, toughest, and most determined debaters.

TOM does not get involved in every issue which floats by the floor, but he understands them all. And on matters pertaining to his Appropriations Subcommittee, he is as tough as an Oklahoma boot.

I think of TOM STEED as a dear and warm friend who has proven his friendship over and over. But I also think of his friendship with President Lyndon B. Johnson, especially during the White House years. When the President needed to know if he had the votes on the Appropriations Committee and if a position could be sustained, he called his friend, TOM STEED, who advised him exactly right.

On August 27, friends of L.B.J. usually gather in Washington or in Austin to celebrate and commemorate the birthday of President Johnson. One year, our group invited TOM STEED to the L.B.J. Ranch as principal speaker. There on the banks of the Pedernales River, under giant oak trees standing stately in L.B.J.'s beloved hill country, TOM STEED simply but eloquently expressed appreciation for President Johnson. We will always remember that kindness.

Those of us in Congress can say simply—and we hope, eloquently—that TOM STEED is a great man. Though TOM has one of the most responsible positions in the House, he moves about the floor with a sense of humor on the affairs at hand, usually telling one story after another to illustrate his point. TOM can start a story early in the morning, and then it circulates and percolates around and around the House. If by the end of the day, the story gets back to TOM, he knows it is a good one.

We have enjoyed TOM STEED's wit and humor and insight for all these years.

Not ever, once have I asked for his help or advice, did he not help. He never makes a grand show or flourish of helping. If he is agreeable, he says it will be done—and my friends, you can make book on his pledge that it will be done.

Without TOM STEED, the House will not be the same. This Chamber will be more sober and serious and dull when TOM leaves us. Without a doubt, he is a genuine character. Most of all, he is one of the greatest, most patriotic Americans of our time.

So we say "Great God Almighty—What a Man."●

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, today, we honor the dean of the Oklahoma congressional delegation, my dear friend and mentor, TOM STEED, who has announced his retirement after 16 consecutive terms as a Member of the House of Representatives.

I feel as if I were saying goodbye to a member of my own family, a cherished uncle, whose humor, wisdom, many kindnesses, genuine warmth and affection, and delightful daily "yarns" have brightened every day for me and so many of "Uncle" TOM STEED's colleagues.

TOM STEED is truly an inspiration—a shining example—not only to new Members, but to all of his "students." It is a great personal pleasure for me to commend and congratulate TOM STEED as he completes his long, distinguished career of dedicated service to his constituents and the Nation. We will all miss his experience, expertise, wit, humility, and sage counsel, and we wish him the very best of everything as he closes out his outstanding career in the House.●

● Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Speaker, TOM STEED has been a landmark in the House for many years.

When I came to Washington in 1961 to become Administrative Assistant to my predecessor, the Honorable David Henderson, he was already a well-established veteran.

I know TOM STEED as having a lot of the characteristics of a fellow Oklahoman, Will Rogers. I would, also, say that he is a great deal like the late great Harry Truman.

He is totally outspoken, unpretentious, and completely frank. If you do not want to know what TOM STEED thinks about something, do not ask him, because if you do, you will find out exactly and without embellishment.

It is too bad that his breed of journalists is disappearing from the American scene. He must have been a heck of an editorial writer when he was managing editor on the Shawnee News and Star.

But the main thing we will all miss when TOM is gone is his weekly joke. He could be depended on to pick up at least one good joke a week and share it with us on the House floor.

Not only has he served conscientiously and well, he has given us an example of the kind of Main Street Americanism we all admire. TOM STEED will be missed. There are not many of his kind left.●

● Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the occasion to say a few words relative to the announcement of our colleague, TOM STEED, that



he will not seek reelection to the House of Representatives.

TOM has been an able and dedicated Member of the Congress for 32 years and chaired the House Appropriations Committee's Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee and later the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee during his distinguished tenure as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

While I am indeed sorry to see him leave after so many years of service together here in the House, I hope the opportunity to take life a little easier will help to restore him to the robust good health which he certainly deserves.●

● Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, TOM STEED has been a most valuable Member of this House since being elected to the 81st Congress in 1948. I wish to join with his many friends in paying tribute to the contributions he has made to this body during his 32-year career. As dean of Oklahoma's congressional delegation, he will be sorely missed, both here and in Oklahoma. His work as chairman of the Appropriations Committee's Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee has touched the life of every American in some way as well as his service on the Small Business Committee. His outstanding integrity while serving on these committees has been admired, respected, and appreciated.

It will be a long time before the House encounters another Member with his dedication to service and his outstanding wit. Few are as deserving of the rewards of retirement as TOM STEED and I want to thank him for his friendship over the years and to extend my warmest best wishes for the future.●

● Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a certain sadness that I learned of TOM STEED's decision to retire at the end of this, the 96th Congress.

I have the pleasure and the honor to serve under the able leadership of TOM STEED on the Treasury-Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee on Appropriations. TOM, in this role exemplifies everything good we can hope to do in this Congress. He has been an able administrator, is a man who really knows the substance and the process of our subcommittee jurisdiction, and he has been a great joy to work with over the past years.

But more important than his extensive expertise is his kindness, consideration, and care for not only his colleagues but for all those with whom he comes into contact. I can think of no higher tribute for this fine man than to say that he is loved and respected. I will miss him, and the Nation will have a great void in leadership in this body with his retirement.

This body has experienced great richness over the 32 years in TOM's career in the House. I wish him well and God's richest blessings for the future.●

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, it is both a sad and a happy occasion to rise today to pay tribute to our colleague TOM STEED. I say sad because we hate to lose his experience and knowledge when the 97th Congress convenes next January. But also happy because

we have had the benefit of his outstanding service for 32 years.

The people of Oklahoma and America have been blessed to have had the public service of TOM STEED for 16 terms in the U.S. House of Representatives. During the last 32 years, he has proved himself to be a man of hard work and dedication.

When TOM was first elected to Congress, he was "one up" on other freshmen Members because he had served as administrative aide to other Oklahoma Members. This prior legislative experience allowed him to jump right in and begin representing his constituents in an outstanding manner on his first day in office.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly thankful for TOM STEED's leadership on the House Appropriations Committee. His voice has always been one of moderation and prudence in Federal spending. He knows the importance of restraining Government budgets and allocating our scarce tax dollars in a prudent and sound manner.

We all wish TOM much happiness and good health in the years to come and thank him for giving so unselfishly of himself in service to his country.●

● Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, in the flood of words that flow from the Nation's Capital, I sometimes think that we have diminished the value of one term that should signify something exceptional, and that term is "a great American."

In my mind, that description rightly applies to only a relative handful of the citizens of our Nation, and sadly, there are few of those great Americans alive today. That is why it is a special honor for me to rise in tribute at this time for one of those true great Americans, our trusted colleague and the dean of the Oklahoma congressional delegation, the Honorable TOM STEED.

During this Congress, I have had the privilege of serving with Chairman STEED as his colleague on the Committee on Appropriations. Before that, since the time I was first elected to the House in 1972, I have had the privilege of knowing him as a trusted friend and as a teacher.

He has been my teacher in the traditions of honor and the canyons of responsibility that bring this body, on occasion, to its rightful stature as the greatest democratic institution of our times. At the same time, he is a man who is quick to point out to us our failings when the House falls short of its responsibilities.

That is why TOM STEED will long be remembered and long be missed when he leaves Washington to return to his beloved Oklahoma. He is a man who embodies the high traditions and the high standards of the Congress, and he has had the patience and the wisdom to seek to instill those values in others.

TOM STEED has been a dedicated servant to his constituents. He has been a tireless guardian of the taxpayers' money in his powerful position on the Appropriations Committee. But he has been a man of insight and innovation as well, and those characteristics have improved the quality of our Government.

One example that comes to my mind is the fact that TOM STEED is the father of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, which has become the West Point of Federal law enforcement. Chairman STEED saw many years ago that our various Federal law officers were operating their training facilities in widely scattered locations, and were teaching similar programs without the advantage of common facilities.

So he led the initiative to establish the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Brunswick, Ga., utilizing and expanding the buildings formerly used as a naval aviation base. Today, some 10,000 students per year come to the Center, and they enjoy the benefits of the finest training in the country, and the taxpayers enjoy the benefits of their improved skills and of the savings in training costs.

Mr. Speaker, the list of innovative concepts that Chairman STEED has implemented could go on and on. The projects and contributions of our colleague will endure for many, many years as a testament to his skill and effectiveness.

We will miss TOM STEED, the legislator. But most of all, we will miss TOM STEED, the friend and leader. I hope and pray that he will make himself available to us for advice and counsel for many years to come.●

● Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, TOM STEED of Oklahoma is retiring from this body after 32 years of service to us and to our country. He is dean of the Oklahoma congressional delegation. Indeed, he has served Oklahoma longer in Congress than any other Member in the history of Oklahoma.

I believe it fair to say that TOM STEED considered himself to be and has acted as if he were a U.S. Congressman from Oklahoma rather than a Congressman from Oklahoma. He has had the courage to put national interests first if and when they should conflict with what some would suggest were the interests of his district. He has had the broad perspective which is necessary to each and every one of us everyday, where we have to ask ourselves whether a given piece of legislation is not only good for our district but for our Nation as well.

As a ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and the Small Business Committee and as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, TOM STEED has served and does serve influentially in the House. He has made his mark on countless pieces of legislation. He has also made his mark on the history of this body.

He is a Member who will be missed. He is a Member who will not be forgotten. He is a Member whom all of Oklahoma and all of the country can be proud.●

● Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to participate today in this special order to say a few words in tribute to our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, TOM STEED, who has decided to retire after 32 years of service in the House.

Congressman STEED is a dedicated, untiring, and able legislator who adheres to high principles which we can all admire.

So, while we pause to reflect on Tom's record and accomplishments, I want to extend my personal best wishes to him and hope that the future is filled with health, happiness, and success.●

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in paying a well-deserved tribute to our distinguished colleague, TOM STEED, who will be leaving the Congress at the close of this session. We have been fortunate to have TOM as a colleague and to have benefited from his extraordinary legislative ability for the past 32 years.

Having served in the House of Representatives for more consecutive terms than any individual from the State of Oklahoma, TOM STEED has effectively represented the people of the fourth district of Oklahoma during that time, and he may now step down from his duties here in Congress knowing that he has served well and contributed significantly to the legislative process.

As a member of the important Appropriations Committee and chairman of that Committee's Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee, he has played a major role in the consideration and passage of major legislation affecting the American taxpayer. His work in the House has gained him a reputation as an energetic, conscientious, hard-working public servant.

TOM STEED has made invaluable contributions to the people of this Nation, and he has certainly been an outstanding asset to his great State of Oklahoma. I want to congratulate him for his handling of the responsibilities of his congressional assignments with intelligence and insight.

Mrs. Derwinski joins with me in extending our best wishes to Tom and his wife, Hazel, and their family for many happy years in retirement.●

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 19, 1980, I was necessarily absent from the House. On that day two votes were taken, and I now announce the votes I would have cast had I been present.

H.R. 6285, the Egg Research and Consumer Information Act, was the subject of rollcall No. 49, on a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes." The bill passed 288 to 82.

H.R. 2492, the bill to extend the duty suspension on feathers and downs, was the subject of rollcall No. 50. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes." The bill passed 371 to 0.●

#### RESEARCH REVITALIZATION ACT OF 1980

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing the Basic Research Revi-

talization Act of 1979 as the Research Revitalization Act of 1980. It is my belief that this legislation is a beginning in the direction we must be committed so that we once again become competitive in the world markets. This is only one step, but it is a beginning.

Every American should be gravely concerned with the growing dimension of the current trade deficit which currently runs at the rate of about \$28 billion per year. Except for the problems caused by imported oil, this deficit would be manageable and correctable. However, the likelihood of long-term requirements for imported oil provide no easy solution for this pressing problem which stimulates inflation in the United States and causes serious market disruption. It therefore becomes exceptionally important for America to develop not only a strong internal base for business but an external base for export business as well. Ways must be found to stimulate foreign purchases in the United States, particularly from the oil producing countries. It is incredible, for example, that Nigeria, from whom we purchase about \$7 billion of oil, uses this tremendous transfer of American dollars to purchase most of its necessary equipment and goods from Japan and Europe and buys only about \$500 million of American goods.

One of the basic American problems is that we are running out of high technology initiatives which are essential in the export marketplace. During World War I and World War II and the subsequent Korean and Vietnam wars, there was a heavy defense expenditure on military technology, which, to a considerable extent, had civilian utilization. Until recently, the defense spending program was a tremendous Government stimulant for research and development in areas that affected the whole spectrum of the economy. America must find a way of relying on something other than war and high defense spending to provide the necessary flow of technology which will make American products attractive to our trading partners.

Domestically, we are suffering a decline in productivity rates because of a lapse in the input of new ideas, new approaches, new machines, and new systems which would stimulate production in the United States and reverse the sag in American productivity.

If we provide tax incentives for the rekindling of research and development in America, it is important that we calculate a method which will maximize the production of new technology with a minimum loss of taxpayer funds—in other words, a system that will have a high benefit ratio of new research and development technology per dollar of resources lost through taxation.

In discussing the shortfall of American technology, industrialists almost unanimously agree that a great part of the research and development that is essential to recover American preeminence in the fields of commerce and trade can best be accomplished on the university campus. The talents of academia are unlimited and underutilized. The laboratories and the teachers who are involved in the development of new technology

are available at considerably lower cost is an academic setting. The underutilization of academia in the development of research and development in the United States today is one of our national shames. The laboratories and the facilities in the university setting are available for multipurpose uses and can be shared in a much more effective and efficient way than if they were installed in each American enterprise separately.

I propose that such research and development conducted in academia be in projects that would be sponsored by individual American corporations or proprietors, to be sure that research and development would be related to an essential product, as essential system, for which there is economic demand for either domestic use or for export. The corporation which would be using a substantial part of its research and development work would, of course, be desirous of projecting technology on the basis of its utilitarian value. In this way the research and development would be conducted with the highest likelihood of utilization.

This proposal would provide an incentive to the business, industrial, commercial, and agriculture sectors to invest its resources in research and development which is carried on in the academia setting. The utilization of university and academic facilities would create higher utilization of facilities in this very important area and increase the capacity of universities and academia to engineer education toward productive pursuits. This program would provide a substitute for military adventures or the space program in providing powerful, energizing forces for the creation of new technology. It will improve the quality of life in the United States and restore demand for American goods from abroad to their former high levels.

The Research Revitalization Act provides a nonrefundable credit to business for 25 percent of the amount contributed in cash to a research reserve. However, the maximum credit is limited to 5 percent of the taxpayer's business income. A deduction is allowed for payment from the reserve if it is used for basic or exploratory research by colleges and universities. A research reserve is a reserve amount which is exempt from income tax.

Penalty provisions are provided for use of reserve funds for other than basic research payments and for retention of amounts in the reserve for more than 4 years. The bill applies to contributions made to the reserve after December 31, 1980.

The Research Revitalization Act of 1980 is as follows:

H.R. 6632

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Research Revitalization Act of 1980".

#### SEC. 2. TAX INCENTIVES FOR RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by inserting after section 44C the following new section:



**"SEC. 44D. CONTRIBUTIONS TO RESERVE FOR RESEARCH BY INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of a taxpayer engaged in a trade or business, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount contributed in cash during the taxable year by the taxpayer to the research reserve of the taxpayer.

"(b) MAXIMUM CREDIT.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) to the taxpayer for the taxable year shall not exceed an amount equal to 5 percent of the taxable income of the taxpayer for such year which is properly allocable to the taxpayer's trade or business. For purposes of the preceding sentence, taxable income shall be computed without regard to the deduction under subsection (c) (2).

**"(c) RESEARCH RESERVE.—**

"(1) EXEMPTION FROM TAX.—Any research reserve shall be exempt from taxation under this title except that such reserve shall be subject to the taxes imposed by section 511 (relating to imposition of tax on unrelated business income of charitable, etc., organizations).

"(2) DEDUCTION FOR PAYMENTS FROM RESERVE.—There shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount equal to the aggregate qualified research expenses paid out of the research reserve of the taxpayer during the taxable year.

"(3) QUALIFIED RESEARCH EXPENSES.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified research expenses' means amounts paid for research or experimentation (within the meaning of section 174) to be performed by any institution of higher education.

"(4) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' means an institution described in section 1201(a) or 491(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as in effect on January 1, 1978).

"(5) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—Any amount allowable as a deduction under this subsection shall not be allowed as a deduction under any other provision of this chapter.

"(d) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section.—

"(1) USE OF RESERVE AMOUNTS FOR OTHER THAN PAYMENT OF QUALIFIED RESEARCH EXPENSES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If any amount in a research reserve is, during a taxable year, used for any purpose other than for the payment of qualified research expenses—

"(i) an amount equal to the amount so used shall be included as taxable income (without regard to other income or deductions) to the taxpayer for the taxable year in which such use commences, and

"(ii) the liability of the taxpayer for the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year shall be increased by an amount equal to 300 percent of the amount so used.

"(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any payment from any reserve within 90 days after the last day prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the return of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year if the amount of such payment is not more than the excess of—

"(i) the aggregate amount of contributions by the taxpayer to such reserve during the taxable year, over

"(ii) the maximum amount of contributions necessary to allow the taxpayer the maximum amount of credit allowable under subsection (a).

"(C) EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS DUE TO RECOMPUTATIONS.—If, after the close of the 90th day under subparagraph (B), there is a recomputation of the maximum credit allowable to the taxpayer under subsection (b) (1) for a taxable year, subparagraph (A)

shall not apply to any payment from any research reserve of the taxpayer if—

"(i) the amount of such payment does not exceed the sum of the excess described in subparagraph (B) with respect to such taxable year, plus the income on such excess.

"(ii) such recomputation was due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect on the part of the taxpayer, and

"(iii) such payment is made at the time prescribed by regulations by the Secretary.

"(2) CONTRIBUTIONS MUST BE SPENT WITHIN 4 YEARS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If any amount remains in a research reserve for more than 4 years after the date such amount was contributed to the reserve (or, in the case of income of the reserve, the date such income was received by the reserve)—

"(i) an amount equal to such amount shall be included as taxable income (without regard to other income or deductions) to the taxpayer for the taxable year in which the last day of the 4th year occurs, and

"(ii) the liability of the taxpayer for the tax imposed by this chapter shall be increased by an amount equal to 300 percent of the amount included in income under clause (i).

"(B) CERTAIN AMOUNTS TREATED AS PAID.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), an amount shall not be treated as remaining in a research reserve on any day if there is a binding commitment on such day to pay such amount from such reserve not later than 1 year after such day. The preceding sentence shall not apply to any amount which is not paid from such reserve during such 1 year.

"(C) FIFO ACCOUNTING REQUIRED FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—For purposes of determining whether an amount has been held in the research reserve for more than 4 years, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, the taxpayer shall allocate payments to contributions and income on a first-in first-out basis.

"(3) UNUSED RESEARCH FUNDS MAY BE REDEPOSITED IN RESERVE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent amounts which have been paid from a research reserve and which have not been spent by the recipient from being returned to such reserve.

"(B) RETURNED AMOUNTS INCLUDED IN INCOME.—Any such amount returned to the research reserve of the taxpayer during the taxable year shall be included in the income of the taxpayer for such year.

"(4) APPLICATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under a section of this subpart having a lower number or letter designation than this section, other than credits allowable by sections 31, 39, and 43.

"(B) TAX IMPOSED BY CHAPTER.—Any tax which is not treated under section 46(a) (4) as imposed by this chapter shall not be treated as imposed by this chapter for purposes of subparagraph (A).

"(e) RESEARCH RESERVE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'research reserve' means any trust—

"(1) which is created or organized under the laws of the United States or of any State (including the District of Columbia) for the taxpayer,

"(2) the exclusive purpose of which is the payment of qualified research expenses of the taxpayer,

"(3) contributions to which may be made only in cash,

"(4) no amount may be contributed to the trust in excess of the amount necessary to allow the taxpayer the maximum amount of credit allowable to the taxpayer under subsection (a).

"(5) the trustee of which is a bank (as defined in section 401(d)(1)), or any person who demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the manner in which such person will administer the trust will be consistent with such purpose, and

"(6) the assets of which will not be commingled with any other property other than in a common trust fund.

"(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section."

"(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b) of section 6096 of such Code (relating to designation of income tax payments to Presidential Election Campaign Fund) is amended by striking out "and 44C" and inserting in lieu thereof "44C, and 44D".

"(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart A of Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 44C the following new item:

"Sec. 44D. Contributions to reserve for research by institutions of higher education."

"(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made after December 31, 1980.●

**MUNICIPAL WASTE TO ENERGY ACT OF 1980**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, today I join my distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from New York (Mr. FISH), Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and Ohio (Mr. BROWN) in introducing legislation to encourage the recovery of energy from municipal wastes.

This bill creates an aggressive program for solving two critical problems at once—disposal of municipal wastes and sewage sludge and creation of significant energy to replace oil from these presently dumped resources.

Waste processing to recover both energy and energy intensive materials is used extensively already in West Germany, England, France, Spain, and Italy. It is shameful that we have barely scratched the surface of testing this important resource in the United States.

This Nation is facing a growing problem in disposing of solid waste and sewage sludge. Currently, the Nation is generating about 200 million tons of solid waste annually and 14 million tons of sewage sludge. Americans are increasingly unwilling to let this vast amount of garbage threaten our environment and health through uncontrolled disposal. By law, ocean dumping of sewage sludge will be prohibited after 1981. Unsanitary disposal of wastes in open dumps or uncontrolled landfills poses major health and safety hazards. Landfill sites are becoming increasingly difficult to obtain as citizens resist their development, as land values increase and as water quality standards block much land from landfill development. Finally, air and water pollution standards now forbid many towns and cities from continuing their traditional means of disposal, such as open burning and uncontrolled incineration.

Happily, we have before us a way to dispose of this garbage in an environ-

mentally sound manner and at the same time to generate a very significant domestic source of energy. In a recent report, the Office of Technology Assessment estimates that if all the energy and energy-intensive materials had been recovered from the municipal waste generated in 1975, the Nation could have saved 2.3 percent of the energy used in that year or the energy equivalent of about 280 million barrels of oil. According to more recent estimates, our growing garbage pile could now yield up to 3.8 percent of our current energy consumption, replacing 510 million barrels of oil per year.

Despite the promise held out by converting garbage and sewage sludge to energy, the process faces serious technical, legal, institutional, social, and financial barriers. Although the cost of disposing of garbage and sludge is increasing, it is still not high enough in many cases to justify the heavy, front-end investment required for a technology that still faces many risks.

Local governments face special financing problems because of their statutory limits on bonded indebtedness or poor credit ratings that limit sales.

In some States, communities are forbidden from entering into long-term contracts for the sale of waste or for the products of resource recovery plants. Yet economically sound resource recovery plants require long-term contracts, often for 10 years or more.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we are introducing today attempts to rectify these problems. It would also strengthen and broaden existing law—the Department of Energy Authorization Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-238)—by authorizing financial assistance to private applicants as well as municipalities for urban waste-to-energy projects.

The administration has been shamefully neglected of this congressionally mandated program. In previous fiscal years, the administration has failed to implement this program—a program that will help us tap the great potential of a near-term energy resource. I was disappointed to see that the administration requested only \$10.9 million for the urban waste-to-energy program in fiscal year 1981, a \$2.1 million reduction from last year. The administration requested funding neither for the loan guarantees under title II of Public Law 95-238 nor for the financial assistance to demonstration plants under title IV of that bill. The Department of Energy has justified this budget by telling us that municipal waste will be one of eight technologies competing for financial assistance as part of the \$2.2 billion energy security reserve contained in the fiscal year 1980 Interior appropriations law. However, no funds to date have been earmarked specifically for waste-to-energy projects out of this reserve. We are concerned that small urban waste projects, in particular, will be lost in any massive program directed primarily at large-scale, synthetic fuel plants.

The bill we are introducing today would establish an accelerated research, development, demonstration, and commercialization program in energy re-

source recovery at the Department of Energy. The bill sets an annual production goal by 1990 of one quad—or the energy equivalent of 172 million barrels of oil—to be recovered from urban waste in the form of energy and energy-intensive materials. Based on estimates from OTA, the Nation has more than enough solid waste available right now to achieve this goal.

This bill would establish within the Department of Energy an Office of Urban Waste Energy Management to give this program the attention it deserves. The director of this office would be responsible for administering the financial assistance programs, for transmitting information to local governments and to the public, and for transmitting information to local governments and to the public, and for training personnel to operate waste-to-energy plants.

Second, this bill would authorize \$50 million in fiscal year 1981 for research, development, and demonstration at the Department of Energy. This sum would include financial assistance in the form of grants, price supports, contracts, loan guarantees, purchase guarantees or cooperative agreements—for demonstration plants. Recognizing that cities are often reluctant to take the risk of owning and operating such facilities, we would make private entities eligible for this assistance as well as cities.

Third, the bill would authorize \$100 million in fiscal year 1981 to assist public and private entities in the heavy front-end cost of building commercial waste-to-energy plants. This assistance would be in the form of loans, grants, loan guarantees, and price guarantees.

Finally, this legislation directs the office to prepare a study in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Commerce, analyzing the financial, institutional, environmental and social barriers to developing energy resources recovery. The report would make recommendations about additional Federal actions needed to encourage this activity. I believe this requirement will help us develop a coordinated management plan to overcome the barriers facing rapid commercialization of waste-to-energy. I believe this legislation shows great merit and for this reason I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.●

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SYNAR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, during consideration on Monday, February 25, 1980, of H.R. 4996, providing for the recognition of the Paiute Indian Bands, I was absent from the House of Representatives on official business. Consequently, I missed the rollcall vote on final passage of the legislation. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."●

#### ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the concept of human rights, in particular the right to self-determination, is one that is interpreted differently by various nations of the globe. To the Soviet Union self-determination exists only outside their sphere of influence. To those unfortunate nations entrapped in their sphere there is little freedom, the people subject to the economic and political exploitation of Moscow.

February 24, 1980, marked the 62d anniversary of the Proclamation of the Independence of the Republic of Estonia. It is an independence on paper at best. It is an independence that should remind the free people of the world that in Estonia the people know of freedom as something that is enjoyed by others. It was in 1939, when Russia established military bases in Estonia, a nation that Russia had recognized as independent in 1920, the Soviet Union explicitly renouncing voluntarily and forever all rights of sovereignty over the Estonian people. In June of 1940, Soviet forces occupied Estonia. Two months later the Russians forcibly made Estonia part of the Soviet Union. Since then, the Estonian people have suffered extremely heavy human and material losses. During the 1940's, the Russians sent about a tenth of Estonia's people to Siberia as punishment for their opposition or their political beliefs. In recent years those who dare to make any requests for freedom and justice, relying on the stipulations of the Helsinki accords, are either confined to mental hospitals or sentenced to prison terms in trials that only serve to make a mockery of the word justice.

In years past, Estonia was a deeply religious nation, its peoples extremely proud of their heritage. Today, it is a nation in which the government discourages religion, where attendance at services often leads to loss of educational opportunities or job advancement. In years past, two-thirds of Estonians farmed the land and lived in rural villages. Today, through Soviet industrialization most of the people work in factories or mines and live in government-owned apartments in cities or towns, the Soviet Union depending heavily on Estonia's manufacturing and mining industries, the mines providing almost three-fourths of the Soviet Union's oil shale.

The United States has never recognized the forcible annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the Soviet Union. What the United States does recognize is the belief that human rights are the most precious of all commodities, and that the process of Russianization, whether it be in Afghanistan, or in the Baltic States, is one of denial and exploitation, injustice, and inhumanity. We owe it to ourselves, who enjoy freedom every day, not to forget the plight of those who await the day when they shall be truly independent.●

#### INTRODUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH CARE REAUTHORIZATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-



man from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act of 1976 to reauthorize funding for the various programs and new initiatives in Indian health established by that act.

In the 94th Congress, we considered comprehensive legislation designed to incrementally bring the state of Indian health up to a par with the rest of the country. The legislation either gave concrete direction to the administration with respect to existing programs and authorities or established new programs.

These programs were designed for a 7-year crash effort with incremental appropriation authorization for each fiscal year.

However, the committees involved felt that it would not be realistic to set funding levels 7 years into the future. Therefore, the legislation was amended to set specific funding levels for each program for fiscal years 1978, 1979, and 1980. Funding levels for fiscal years 1981, 1982, 1983, and 1984 were to be set by subsequent legislation.

In order to assist Congress in making this later determination as to appropriate funding levels, the act requires the Secretary of HEW to submit a report to Congress making recommendations on funding levels. Section 701 provides, that—

Within three months after the end of fiscal year 1979, the Secretary shall review expenditures and progress made under this Act and make recommendations to the Congress concerning any additional authorizations for fiscal years 1981 through 1984 for programs authorized under this Act which he deems appropriate.

Despite constant prodding by the committee, we have yet to receive any such report. Because of the failure of the administration to submit the required report, we have no guidance on appropriate funding levels for these programs for the next 4 fiscal years.

Therefore, the levels contained in my bill are somewhat arbitrary. I am sure that the hearing process will more clearly define the necessary levels of authorization in order to continue the effort to raise Indian health standards more nearly on a par with the non-Indian community. ●

#### ON THE RETIREMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE BILL HARSHA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, there is a time-honored custom in this body that dictates the delivery of fulsome praise for those of our colleagues who are closing out their congressional service and retiring to private life.

I rise today in tribute to one such Member, not in trite observance of congressional custom, but rather with heartfelt regret that our friend and colleague of many years' standing, Representative WILLIAM H. HARSHA, has chosen not to seek reelection next November.

BILL HARSHA has served with me on

the Public Works and Transportation Committee since he entered the Congress in 1961, and for the past 10 years he has been the ranking minority member and an extraordinarily forceful contributor to the work of that committee.

In the course of those years, I have come to know the gentleman from Ohio both as a warm personal friend and as a lawmaker of uncommon ability. His imprint is on every major enactment that has come out of the Public Works Committee in the past two decades—most notably landmark legislation to protect and strengthen our national transportation system, to reduce the tragic toll of death and injury on our highways, to foster economic and industrial development in areas that have been left out of the mainstream of our national prosperity, and to provide productive work for hundreds of thousands of disadvantaged Americans.

BILL HARSHA and I sit on opposite sides of the aisle in this great deliberative body, but, in all the years I have known him, partisanship has never obscured his vision of the national interest. In large measure, it is thanks to his nonpartisan cooperation and support that our committee has achieved one of the most successful legislative records in the history of the Congress.

A man of rare quality, whose uncommon commonsense and unfailing wit have enlivened and enriched the discussions of this body for almost 20 years, Congressman HARSHA will be sorely missed—not least by me.

Two months ago, when he announced his decision to retire from public office, BILL HARSHA phrased his announcement in words of characteristic self-effacement:

The citizens of my District have afforded me the highest possible honor in allowing me to serve them.

He said:

and, for that privilege, I offer them my undying gratitude.

I should like the RECORD to show, Mr. Speaker, that his constituents, and, indeed, all the people of America, owe the gentleman from Ohio their own undying gratitude for the privilege of his service.

I know that I speak for all of us in the Congress in wishing for BILL, his lovely wife, Rosemary, and their four sons, all the best in life for all the years that lie before them. ●

#### CAPITATION GRANT ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation that addresses a problem several medical schools have as a result of responding to two Government programs. One of these schools, Loyola University Stritch School of Medicine, serves the Chicago area.

Loyola's Stritch School of Medicine increased its enrollment over the past 10 years in response to several Federal programs, and had a class size of 130 in 1972.

The school received a 7-year grant from the Veterans' Administration which

obligated them to admit 13 additional first-year students. Therefore, the school had two separate commitments to two different Federal agencies.

Under the terms of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the Stritch School of Medicine had obligated itself to a class size of 130 students. In 1975, they accepted an additional 13 students that obligated them under the conditions of the 7-year Veterans' Administration grant.

The school received Veterans' Administration approval to terminate entry of new students for the current year, 1979-80. However, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare notified Stritch that under the terms of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the school had to maintain in the year the same enrollment that it had in 1976, that is, 143. The school complied but finds that the entering class for 1980-81 must also be 143 in order to qualify for capitation grant funds.

This bill allows the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to exclude increases in enrollment due to Veterans' Administration programs for purposes of determining first-year enrollment requirements for capitation grant assistance.

The bill follows:

H.R. 6623

A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide that enrollment increases made by schools of medicine to receive assistance from the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered in determining if the schools have met the first-year enrollment requirements for capitation grant assistance under title VII of such Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 771(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 295f-1(a)(1)) is amended by inserting after "first-year enrollment" the following: "(determined without regard to any increase in such enrollment made by the school to enable it to qualify for financial assistance under chapter 82 of title 38, United States Code)". ●

#### THE NATIONAL HERITAGE POLICY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KOSTMAYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor the administration's National Heritage Policy Act, H.R. 6504, introduced last week by Congressman PHILLIP BURTON, the distinguished chairman of the National Parks and Insular Affairs Subcommittee, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and cosponsored by Congressmen SEBELIUS, SEIBERLING, VENTO, and BINGHAM.

A primary aim of the proposed heritage program is to establish means of avoiding the conflicts between the Nation's requirements for economic development and environmental protection. Meeting this challenge in the context of today's energy and fiscal constraints does not mean that we must sacrifice our commitment to protecting and enhancing the quality of the environment. It does mean that we have a tremendous responsibility to insure that we are pur-

suing the most cost-effective approach to preserving this quality. The National Heritage Policy Act represents just such a responsible solution to this problem.

The key to avoiding such conflict is the consistent collection, exchange, and use of natural and cultural heritage resource information as a regular part of all resource decisionmaking activities. Using the States as the central points in this information exchange network, the national heritage program proposes to increase cooperation among ongoing heritage resource activities of State and local governments, private groups, and the Federal agencies. Such overall coordination will save money and time, speed up project-by-project environmental studies, and help avoid the possibility of unforeseen development versus environment conflicts—such as occurred at the Tellico Dam.

Pennsylvania is a State with a rich and varied cultural and natural heritage. It is also a State which has been at the heart of America's industrial growth and development for more than a century. That these two facets of Pennsylvania's character have been so well reconciled to date is a reflection of the concern and dedication of the citizens of Pennsylvania. Their continued reconciliation will depend upon a well-organized and coordinated statewide environmental conservation effort such as is espoused under the National Heritage Policy Act.

Pennsylvania has already laid a strong foundation for a statewide heritage conservation program. Heritage-related activities already in place include a natural area inventory of State lands, State wild and scenic rivers and trails planning programs, an inventory of historic sites, and State game and fish habitat conservation programs. The department of environmental resources has also begun a classification of the State's natural resources. The State is currently considering alternative approaches to improving the coordination of all these related activities through some type of State heritage program.

The passage of the National Heritage Policy Act will facilitate the efforts of Pennsylvania and all States to continue to save the best of the environment for this and future generations while not impeding the type of balanced growth and development which is also essential to America's future.●

#### PHENOMENON OF DISAPPEARANCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BONKER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the International Organizations Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee which I chair, recently held several hearings on the phenomenon of disappearances, as a violation of human rights. We received excellent and detailed testimony from nongovernmental organizations concerning the scope and history of the "disappeared." We also heard dramatic and tragic testimony from individuals with firsthand knowledge of the disappearance phenomenon.

Mr. Speaker, what emerges from the reports presented to us, is a shocking picture of the violation of human rights on an unprecedented scale. Though most of the documented cases of the disappeared person have come from Latin America, witnesses have testified that this phenomenon is occurring around the world with numerous cases reported in Asia, Africa, and behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Speaker, disappearance of persons resulting from officially sanctioned political kidnappings are relatively new and one of the most serious and tragic human rights and international law violations facing the world today. There is no doubt that numerous regimes in our contemporary world must rely on repression to continue their existence. As one witness related to us—

World indignation denies these regimes the use of torture, or arbitrary and prolonged detention or horrendous inhuman prison conditions as a means of intimidation and control; then some other instrument—disappearances—will be developed.

Mr. Speaker, this violation of human rights takes many forms. Governments may direct their security forces, military, or police to detain persons suspected of subversion in order to remove them from circulation, obtain information and demoralize the opposition. Security or police forces may operate unofficially, generally in civilian clothes, with the state's tacit approval and protection. Groups of civilians may operate their own progovernment terrorist forces. In all cases, people are abducted from homes, offices, or public places.

Mr. Speaker, it does not matter in what part of the world these violations occur. Whether it is in Soviet dominated areas or Argentina, the result is always the same—people disappear.

For example, a Swedish diplomat, Raoul Wallenberg, went to Budapest in 1944 after the Nazis began deporting Hungary's 700,000 Jews to extermination camps. He printed thousands of Swedish passports and distributed them to Jews as a prelude to emigration to Sweden, while at the same time building a system of safe houses, that is, hospitals and shelters over which the Swedish flag flew. He continuously went to the railroad yards, pulling Jews off the death trains; he went to the SS, threatening them and forcing them to release their captives. When the Russians captured Budapest in January 1945, he disappeared. The Soviets insist that he died in 1947, but over the ensuing three decades there have been eyewitness reports that Wallenberg is alive in a Soviet prison. Where is Raoul Wallenberg? What has happened to him? Why is it a crime to have saved tens of thousands of lives?

As another example, in Argentina, one does not need to be a terrorist to be arrested, tortured, or murdered. It is enough to have belonged to a trade union or a student organization or to have helped persons classified by the military as subversive. People are simply picked up, some to return as corpses, minus their heads and hands to prevent identification. A few are released and warned not

to speak, but most are subject to brutal conditions in secret camps.

Mr. Speaker, until recently, little international attention focused on this terrifying violation of human rights. At a recent session of the United Nations General Assembly, a resolution was passed asking for intergovernmental cooperation to search and account for the disappeared, and to hold law enforcement and security authorities fully accountable for disappearances.

More recently, a subcommission of the United Nations adopted a resolution stating that disappearances continue to occur and that the "dangers involved for such persons warrant urgent reaction."

This week, the U.N. Human Rights Commission is meeting in Geneva to consider the question of disappearances.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of disappearances demands action by the United States and all members of the international community. Therefore, I am introducing a sense of the Congress resolution which is cosponsored by Representatives ZABLOCKI, BINGHAM, SOLARZ, STUDDS, PEASE, BARNES, GRAY, HALL, WOLPE, FITHIAN, DERWINSKI, FINDLEY, BUCHANAN, GILMAN, PRITCHARD, FENWICK, WOLFF, BONIOR, KILDEE, OTTINGER, HARKIN, and OBERSTAR.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution expresses the sense of the Congress with respect to the disappearances of persons which is caused by the abduction and clandestine detention of those persons by the governments of foreign countries or by international or transnational terrorist organizations. It calls upon the President to encourage the leaders of other countries to join with him in calling upon the United Nations to: First, condemn such abduction and detention as an act of terrorism; second, to establish effective procedures for dealing with cases of disappeared persons, and third, to demand governments to investigate all reports of disappearances, prosecute those responsible, and account for any person who has disappeared.●

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FROST (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. DIXON (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRISHAM) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FISH, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MICHEL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GILMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAHALL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)



Mr. VANIK, for 10 minutes, today.  
 Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.  
 Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. DINGELL, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. OTTINGER, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. RUSSO, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. SYNAR, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. ADDABBO, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. UDALL, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. JOHNSON of California, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 10 minutes, today.  
 Mr. KOSTMAYER, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. BONKER, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. NEAL, for 60 minutes, on March 4.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRISHAM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHUSTER.  
 Mr. SYMMS in four instances.  
 Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE.  
 Mr. LEE.  
 Mr. GRADISON.  
 Mr. MCCLORY in two instances.  
 Mr. GOLDWATER.  
 Mr. BETHUNE.  
 Mr. CARTER.  
 Mr. LAGOMARSINO.  
 Mrs. HECKLER.  
 Mr. BOB WILSON.  
 Mr. PORTER in two instances.  
 Mr. ROUSSELOT in two instances.  
 Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.  
 Mr. ABDNOR in two instances.  
 Mr. KEMP.  
 Mr. JEFFRIES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAHALL), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KOSTMAYER.  
 Mr. THOMPSON.  
 Mr. BENJAMIN.  
 Mr. GUARINI.  
 Mr. WOLFF in two instances.  
 Mr. BRODHEAD.  
 Mr. MAZZOLI.  
 Mr. ROSENTHAL.  
 Mr. CLAY.  
 Mr. FLIPPO.  
 Mr. UDALL in two instances.  
 Mr. SKELTON.  
 Mr. RANGEL.  
 Mr. DRINAN.  
 Mr. RICHMOND.  
 Mr. ALEXANDER.  
 Mr. PATTERSON.  
 Mr. RODINO.  
 Mr. MARKEY.  
 Mr. CONYERS.  
 Mr. FLORIO.  
 Mr. RUSSO.  
 Mr. COTTER in five instances.  
 Mr. SMITH of Iowa.  
 Mr. WAXMAN.  
 Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.  
 Mr. MAGUIRE.  
 Mr. MURPHY of New York.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.  
 The motion was agreed to; accord-

ingly (at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27, 1980, at 3 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3565. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the sixth annual report on rationalization/standardization within NATO, pursuant to section 302(c) of Public Law 93-365, as amended, and section 814(b) of Public Law 94-106, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3566. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend certain Federal laws relating to housing, community and neighborhood development and preservation and related programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BEILENSEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 586. Resolution waiving certain points of order against the conference report on the bill (S. 643) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to revise the procedures for the admission of refugees, to amend the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 to establish a more uniform basis for the provision of assistance to refugees, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 96-786). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:  
 H.R. 6605. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act to provide a career intern program to encourage school districts and community based organizations to carry out programs to improve the educational employment opportunity for youths; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself and Mr. REUSS) (by request):

H.R. 6606. A bill to amend and extend certain Federal laws relating to housing, community and neighborhood development and preservation and related programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY:  
 H.R. 6607. A bill to facilitate completion of land planning mandated by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended, by designating certain National Forest System roadless areas for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, and by providing for nonwilderness multiple-use management of other roadless areas, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

By Mr. GORE:  
 H.R. 6608. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require infant formulas to provide certain nutrient levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

H.R. 6609. A bill to provide for the return of federally condemned property to its former owner when the Federal Government does not use such property for the stated purpose; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H.R. 6610. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase to \$7,500 the maximum deduction for contributions to retirement savings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGHES:

H.R. 6611. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide procedures for administrative correction of the dates of birth of certain naturalized citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H.R. 6612. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide certain tax incentives for expenditures resulting in energy conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 6613. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, in order to prohibit regulation of collective bargaining agreements by the Federal Maritime Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. PRITCHARD):

H.R. 6614. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the national sea grant program for fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1983, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. AMBRO, Mr. WALKER, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. BLANCHARD):

H.R. 6615. A bill to amend the National Ocean Pollution Research and Development and Monitoring Planning Act of 1978 to authorize appropriations to carry out the provisions of such act for fiscal year 1981; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Science and Technology.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. AMBRO, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BAUMAN, and Mr. BLANCHARD):

H.R. 6616. A bill to amend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 to authorize appropriations to carry out the provisions of such act for fiscal year 1981, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Science and Technology.

By Mr. NOWAK:

H.R. 6617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow rapid amortization for buildings and equipment, and to take into account 100 percent of the cost of property for purposes of determining qualified investment under the investment tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H.R. 6618. A bill to amend the Federal reclamation laws to permit contracts with irrigation districts to be amended so as to permit persons within a district to receive deliveries of project water without regard to the acreage limitations of the Federal reclamation laws upon the payment of sums (determined on a sliding-scale varying with the amount of water delivered) which reflect the actual costs incurred in providing such water, including operating and maintenance costs of the Federal water project, construction costs, and applicable interest charges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina):

H.R. 6619. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to establish a comprehensive energy conservation services program designed to enable low-income individuals and families, and severely handicapped individuals, to participate in energy assistance programs; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Science and Technology.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 6620. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enlarge the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE (for himself and Mr. BOB WILSON): (by request):

H.R. 6621. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of Energy for national security programs for fiscal year 1981, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRITCHARD:

H.R. 6622. A bill to amend certain Federal housing laws for the purpose of assuring that no discrimination is made on the basis of the marital status of applicants for assistance under programs established by such laws; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 6623. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide that enrollment increases made by schools of medicine to receive assistance from the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered in determining if the schools have met the first-year enrollment requirements for capitation grant assistance under title VII of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHULZE:

H.R. 6624. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the dollar amount which is required before certain gambling winnings are subject to income tax withholding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHARP (for himself, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BREAU, Mr. CAVANAUGH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. LEACH of Louisiana, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. LUKE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, and Mr. VENTO):

H.R. 6625. A bill to amend the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 to further the objectives of national energy policy of conserving oil and natural resources through removing excessive burdens on production of coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa (by request):

H.R. 6626. A bill to consolidate and modify the terms of SBA programs under section 7(a), 7(e), 7(h), 7(i) and 7(l) of the Small Business Act and sections 501 and 502 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, to exempt SBA loans from the environmental impact requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and to limit the annual amount of SBA loans, guarantees and other obligations or commitments to the extent or amounts provided in appropriations acts; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. STAGGERS (by request) (for himself, Mr. UDALL and Mr. FUQUA):

H.R. 6627. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for civilian programs for fiscal year 1981 and fiscal year 1982, and for other purposes; divided and referred as follows: Title I to the Committee on Science and Technology; Titles II

and III to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Title IV to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Title V concurrently to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Title VI concurrently to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Science and Technology; and Titles VII and VIII concurrently to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Interior and Insular Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Science and Technology.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 6628. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and section 305 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6629. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (90 Stat. 1400) to reauthorize appropriations for the various programs therein; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL (by request):

H.R. 6630. A bill to establish the Western Arctic Management Area in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6631. A bill to provide for the settlement of the land claims of the Cayuga Indian Nation in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WINN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. STOKES, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mrs. HECKLER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FARY, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. GRAY, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. DORNAN):

H.R. 6632. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide taxpayers engaged in a trade or business a credit against income tax for amounts contributed to a reserve the payments from which must be used for research and experimentation by institutions of higher education and to provide a deduction for such payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONKER (for himself, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. PEASE, Mr. BARNES, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H. Con. Res. 285. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the disappearance of persons which is caused by the abduction and clandestine detention of those persons by the governments of foreign countries or by international or transnational terrorist organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

H. Con. Res. 286. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should seek the support of other nations for the establishment of an International Office of Diplomatic Security within the Secretariat of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

H. Con. Res. 287. Concurrent resolution to provide for the purchase of a certain

statue of George Washington and for the placement of such statue on the East Front of the Capitol Building, or in any appropriate location inside such building; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 288. Concurrent resolution authorizing a statue of Frederick Douglass to be placed in the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. HOLLAND introduced a bill (H.R. 6633) for the relief of Henry D. Barnett, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1138: Mr. CORMAN.

H.R. 1370: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. MOTT, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ROE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. EVANS of the Virgin Islands, Mr. YATRON, Mr. WYATT, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MAGUIRE, and Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 1918: Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. WINN, and Mrs. BOUGUARD.

H.R. 2158: Mr. ANTHONY.

H.R. 2206: Mr. BEDELL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. McCLODY, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. HANCE, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. STANTON, Mr. RUNNELS, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 2644: Mr. HAGEDORN.

H.R. 3106: Mr. DECKARD.

H.R. 3179: Mr. FLORIO, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DIXON, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. GUYER.

H.R. 3609: Mr. APPELGADE, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MATTOX, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. BROYHILL, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 4805: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mr. MAZZOLI.

H.R. 5022: Mr. SIMON, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 5607: Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. CAVANAUGH, and Mr. HARKIN.

H.R. 5899: Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GUYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. LEACH of Louisiana, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 6070: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 6074: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. BONKER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. ROE, Mr. SLACK, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. FLIPPO.



H.R. 6152: Mr. MADIGAN.

H.R. 6177: Mr. GRAMM and Mr. KRAMER.

H.R. 6212: Mr. BURGNER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. FORSYTHE, and Mr. LLOYD.

H.R. 6422: Mr. BOLAND, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. FROST, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. KEMP, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. GRAY, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MINETA, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. ROE, Mr. MINISH, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. FISH, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. STACK.

H.R. 6424: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. HINSON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LOTT, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. WON PAT.

H.R. 322: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.J. Res. 414: Mr. BAILEY.

H.J. Res. 460: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COTTER, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FARY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LOWRY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. PRICE, Mr. SIMON, Mr. STEWART, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H.J. Res. 463: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. CONABLE, and Mr. LEDERER.

H.J. Res. 501: Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. STEED, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. WINN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. EVANS of the Virgin Islands, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STACK, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. GRAY, Mr. LEACH of Louisiana, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. BLANCHARD.

H. Con. Res. 273: Mr. HUGHES.

H. Con. Res. 274: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H. Con. Res. 282: Mr. BONKER.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 6081

By Mr. BAUMAN:

—Page 5, immediately after line 8 insert the following new subsection:

"(k) Up to one per centum of the funds made available to Nicaragua from amounts authorized in subsection (b) shall be used to make publicly known to the people of Nicaragua the extent of United States aid programs to them. The President shall periodically report to the Congress on the effectiveness of his efforts to carry out this subsection."

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

—Page 4, line 18, immediately after "(1)" insert (1); and immediately after line 24 insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) Such local currency loan programs shall be monitored and audited by such agency or official of the United States as the President deems appropriate, and the President shall submit quarterly reports on such loan programs to the Congress."

By Mr. KRAMER:

—Page 5, immediately after line 8, insert the following:

"(k) The President shall terminate assistance under this chapter if he determines that the Government of Nicaragua engages in systematic violations of free speech and press."

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO:

—Page 3, in line 9, immediately after "(d)" insert "(1)"; and immediately after line 13 insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) The President shall terminate assistance under this chapter if he determines, or if either House of Congress by a vote of two-thirds of those present and voting determines, that the Government of Nicaragua has engaged in a consistent pattern of violations of human rights. In the event of such a determination, the outstanding balance

of any loans to the Government of Nicaragua, or any of its agencies or instrumentalities, of funds authorized to be appropriated by this chapter shall become immediately due and payable."

—Page 5, immediately after line 8 insert the following new subsection:

"(k)(1) Any loan to the Government of Nicaragua of funds authorized to be appropriated under this chapter shall be at a rate of interest not less than the current average interest rate, as of the last day of the month preceding the signing of the loan agreement, that the United States Government pays on outstanding marketable obligations of comparable maturity commencing not later than ten years following the date on which the funds are initially made available under the loan, during which ten-year period the rate of interest shall not be lower than two per centum per annum.

"(2) Any agreement between the United States and the Government of Nicaragua regarding any loan programs administered by the Government of Nicaragua, or any of its agencies or instrumentalities, utilizing local currency generated in conjunction with funds provided under this chapter, shall require that the rate of interest charged on local currency loans under any such program shall be no greater than the rate of interest charged on loans under this chapter to the Government of Nicaragua plus such additional interest charge as may be necessary to cover reasonable costs of administering such local currency loans."

By Mr. RUDD:

—Page 5, immediately after line 8 insert the following new subsection:

"(k) Any agreement between the United States and the Government of Nicaragua regarding the use of funds authorized to be appropriated under this chapter, made available in the form of loans, shall specifically require that such loan funds shall be used for the purchase of goods or services from any United States citizen or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens."